CUM ILLI GRAECI SINT, NOS LATINI:
Western Rite Orthodoxy and the Eastern Orthodox Church

by

Jack Turner

Bachelor of Arts
University of South Carolina, 2002

Master of Arts
University of South Carolina, 2005

Submitted to the

University of Wales

in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Theology

in the Department of Theology and Religious Studies

Lampeter

2010

© Copyright by Jack Turner, 2010
All Rights Reserved.

Also for Jammie…

"What then shall we do, since they are Greeks and we are Latins?"
St Augustine of Hippo
Conta Iulianum

ABSTRACT

In the era prior to the Great Schism of 1054, Christianity was one Church composed of two culturally distinct elements: the Greek East and Latin West. The Greek and Latin halves of the Church each possessed their own independent liturgical and cultural customs which were part of the dispute that lead to the Great Schism, effectively separating the Church into independent Greek and Latin sides. While the West had retained liturgical expressions that differed from the majority Western Rite (in the form of the Italo-Albanian Catholic Church, which remained in communion with Rome after the official break with Constantinople), the Christian East was exclusively composed of Churches celebrating the Byzantine Rite for approximately nine hundred years. This changed in the latter half of the nineteenth century with the conversion of Julius Joseph Overbeck to the Russian Orthodox Church in London. Since that time, there have been attempts and successes in establishing a Western Rite in the Eastern Church.

This thesis approaches Western Rite Orthodoxy as an established phenomenon in Eastern Christianity, especially as a facet of Orthodoxy in countries where Orthodoxy constitutes a minority. While previous short studies have attempted to substantiate or discredit the legitimacy of Western Rite Orthodoxy as a movement, this thesis accepts the reality of the Western rite and seeks to understand Western Rite Orthodoxy by documenting its history thoroughly, the investigating peculiarities of the Orthodox Western rite compared to other Western liturgies, exposing potential problems (spiritual and canonical) of the current rite and devotions when compared to accepted Orthodox theology and spirituality, and by evaluating some of the criticisms which are often employed against Western Rite Orthodoxy. To complete this critical evaluation, there are some important areas of consideration.

Though there have been some studies of Western Rite Orthodoxy, there has been little historical documentation of the movement since the middle part of the twentieth century. Part of Western Rite Orthodoxy's development has been the alteration of liturgical texts to bring them into conformity with the theology and spirituality of the Eastern Church. There is some question, both in academic and ecclesiastical circles, about how thoroughly these changes were implemented, whether there are still elements requiring further correction, and even if the Western liturgies can be brought into conformity with Eastern theology and practice in any instance. Furthermore, there is are ecumenical implications to the presence of Western Rite Orthodoxy that have yet to be addressed, particularly in the Western Rite Orthodox rejection of post-Vatican II liturgies used by the majority of Western Christianity, and the effect this might have on a future reunion between a Western Church and Orthodoxy. With this critical framework established, there is a greater opportunity to fully understand Western Rite Orthodoxy in the twentieth century, both as it affects the Orthodox Church itself and as it affects external relationships between the Orthodox and other Christian churches. Secondarily, the thesis provides a more complete history in terms of documentation and contextualization of Western Rite Orthodoxy than is presently available through any other medium.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are also individuals who have made substantive contribution to the work at hand in an informal way and who deserve credit for their important contributions. Firstly, credit goes to Fr. Paul Schneirla who made his expertise available to my disposal through a series of telephone interviews and written correspondence from 2007 through 2009. His knowledge of Western rite history provided some of the anecdotal details for the history for important individuals in the AWRV, though he requested that our correspondence not be quoted directly and I have sought to honour that request as much as is possible. From the ROCOR Western rite, I must thank Aristibule 'Ari' Adams who introduced me to Fr David and Fr Michael Wood, who have proven to be excellent sources for the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy in their respective communities. Additionally, Fr Ben Johnson of St Catherine's Orthodox Mission (Antiochian Archdiocese) has been an invaluable source of updated news on Western Rite Orthodoxy through his blog *Western Orthodox*, though he is probably unaware that I have been reading his updates diligently throughout my research. Other sources of assistance include Ben Andersen and Fr Matthew Thurman for their blogs and Andersen additionally for his informally published papers across the web. Both individuals pointed me towards less obvious sources which proved helpful in writing the historical sections. Other sources of important information include Fr Heiromonk Aiden (Keller) for his generosity through providing his own written works, some of which were invaluable for pointing me towards topics I was unaware existed. Two others who deserve mention are Dr. Karen Westfield-Tucker of Boston University who edited a portion of Chapter 6 in preparation for publication (subsequently published as '"We Beseech Thee to Send Down Thy Holy Spirit": History, Liturgy, and Theology in the Epiclesis Text of the Divine Liturgy of St. Gregory' *Studia Liturgica* 39.2 (2009) 202-15), and who's comments were invaluable for making that section of the work strong; and Dr. Paul Meyendorff of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary who edited my literature review in preparation for its publication in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, even though the version which appears in this thesis bears no resemblance to the one which was published. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my thesis supervisor, Dr. Andreas Andreopoulos, whose suggestions to earlier drafts of this work made for a superior finished product.

PREFACE

My interest in Western Rite Orthodoxy came to me in a rather unusual manner. Having not been raised Orthodox or Roman Catholic, I had little idea what the 'Western Rite' was, and an undergraduate, I was only vaguely aware that such a thing even existed. However, taking my first theology course, I decided to browse the websites of the various Orthodox churches in North America, trying to find more simplified versions of the materials presented in class lectures as a means of helping me remember all of the very new information that I was being taught. How beneficial a strategy this was could be debated but in peeking through those websites, I did manage to find a frequently asked questions section on the website of the OCA. While pursuing the topics which had been answered on the site, I distinctly remember that one topic was related to something called 'Western Rite Orthodoxy'. Not having had a significant experience with the Orthodox Church to that point, I had simply assumed that all Orthodox Churches were Byzantine rite, though even at that time I had no real way of knowing exactly what that was, either. As a result, I read the response that was offered and went about my way, filing the fact that there was in actuality something called 'Western Rite Orthodoxy' without giving the topic much further thought.

That changed a few years later when, a semester into my graduate work, I began looking for more material related to the study of Christian liturgy generally, but to the Liturgy of John Chrysostom more specifically, thinking at the time I would write my Master's Thesis on the subject. Through one of my professors, several Orthodox and Eastern Catholic clergy were approached for their suggestions. Among the recommended reading I received from this group, one priest, who also happened to be a former student of my professor, mentioned that I should also look into Western Rite Orthodoxy. Since he had provided me with a weblink rather than a book title and because the information was not really related to my current path of research, I set aside the suggestion and began the

work of further refining my topic, ultimately making on something quite different from that which I had original intended, as it would seem is usually the case in these circumstances.

I would like to say that the idea to study Western Rite Orthodoxy thoroughly came in a flash or an epiphany of some sort. In truth, it came about rather by accident. In preparing to transition from a postgraduate life to one of full-time, non-academic work with the possibility of doctoral studies on the side, I began browsing through my old school papers with the aim of clearing out some of the material to make space for new photocopies or other papers I might need to retain for reference. It was at this point that I came across the e-mail I had received at the start of my graduate studies referring Western Rite Orthodoxy. At the time, I was considering what sorts of things I might want to do with my academic work, and thought that the subject of Western Rite Orthodoxy might make for an excellent post-doctoral study, something to take on after I had passed that first hurdle for getting tenure and needed something even further down the line, which I might research in preparation for further promotion. So, dutifully again, I filed Western Rite Orthodoxy in my brain, though in a more prominent place than it had previously received. In truth, I had little idea what I might want to study for a thesis. Feeling, or fearing, that any doctoral work would in some way bind me to a specific scholarly pursuit for the next several years beyond the dissertation (or, indeed, for my entire career), I approached the topic of my doctoral research with some trepidation. At the time, I thought it would be wise to study the subject of infant communion, which interested me then and still does for a number of different reasons. This was, at least, what I had told my MA professors who inquired where I saw my research going.

However, circumstances made the choice of Western Rite Orthodoxy seem natural with the selection of a supervisor in Andreas Andreopoulos and preparing my paperwork for admission to the University of Wales, Lampeter. I approached him with my interest in infant communion but added a comment about the possibility of research on the Western Rite since it was already in my range of ideas and since Dr. Andreopoulos was director of the MA in Orthodox Studies at the university, it seemed an acceptable offer. As might be expected, he was quite interested in my study of the Western rite, with the mention that he had earlier in that very week mentioned to his students that this was

an area of study which was severely underdeveloped. The serendipity of everything seemed appropriate so, without much ado, the selection was made and I steadied myself for my studies.

A work of this magnitude is clearly not undertaken alone, and is certainly more obvious to me in my present circumstances. There are a number of people whom I wish to thank, who have helped me directly or indirectly throughout the writing process. The most obvious and first person who should be thanked is Dr. Andreopoulos who has been mentor, teacher, and coach throughout my research and writing. He has been ever gracious with my work and always ready with an encouraging word throughout the process; simultaneously, he has also been content to watch me develop my own thoughts with regards to my topic, ever confident that I had a sufficient grasp of my material and a reasonable work schedule to complete my writing in a timely fashion. Where I have found administrative hurdles or difficulties with the system, Andreas was there to help me work them out, even to the point of pleading my case before the necessary loci of authority at the University; it is no exaggeration to say that his help, especially as I completed most of my work in the United States, was invaluable, that he has gone above and beyond the call of duty for even a great supervisor (which he already was), and it is perhaps no understatement to confess that without his help, especially in this area, I might not have graduated at all, much less in the time frame I was able to complete my thesis.

I would also like to thank my graduate assistants over the past several years: Heather Ammons, Tim Slice, and Laura Ybarra. Each of these individuals, in their own ways, was a source of encouragement as I worked through completing my thesis, sometimes in very big ways and others in very small ways. At the very least, the relief they provided from many of my normal duties provided time to research, think, and write, and without their help I would have encountered a much more difficult time balancing my thesis will all my other responsibilities. Dr. Robert Hungerford and Dr. Christ Nesmith, successively my direct supervisors at the University of South Carolina Evening School and Extended University (respectively), will always have my gratitude for they have provided me with a number of opportunities to teach and to hone my skills as an instructor, preparation which has provided me with an invaluable head start. Dr. Nesmith in particular has constantly sought new and innovate ways to extend teaching of

Religious Studies in the evening hours at the University of South Carolina, and I have been the recipient (sometimes victim) of those endeavours, but I would not wish it to be any other way. I also owe a debt of gratitude to my colleagues in the Religious Studies Department at the University of South Carolina, especially Dr. Waleed El-Ansary, Dr. James Cutsinger, and especially Dr. Carl Evans. Dr. Evans, who took me on as a MA student and encouraged me in my scholarly development, has been a genuine mentor to me through the years, finding opportunities for teaching and providing subtle assistance (and sometimes a not too subtle reality check) whenever I seemed to need it. I owe him a debt of gratitude I cannot repay, because I would not be half the scholar I am today, however little that may be, if it were not for him. To each of these persons, I owe my thanks mentoring me through my writing and early development as a teacher. I am proud to call them my colleagues and I would hope that they would not think it too bold of me to suggest that I am also proud to call them my friends.

In addition to those individuals already named in the Acknowledgments who have aided me (whether they knew they had or not), I would like to extend a word of thanks to the following individuals: Heiromonk Ambrose (ROCOR), Fr. John McMonagle (Holy Synod of Milan), Fr. Philip Rogers (Antiochian Archdiocese), and Archbishop Anthony (HCACNA), all of whom have read portions of the work and who's interest in my scholarly activities provided a motivating factor for competing my studies and getting on with the business of actually writing.

Finally, but by no means of least importance, I want to thank Jammie. She has been companion, editor, cheerleader, physician, and longsuffering spouse. Among all the individuals who has contributed to this work, her constant reading, re-reading, suggesting and listening, and reading yet again, have been invaluable, and it is easy to say that the work would not be good as it may otherwise have been. It is to her that all my efforts are lovingly dedicated. I could wish it to be any other way.

6 August
Feast of the Transfiguration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declarations and Statements iv
Abstract v
Acknowledgements vi
Preface vii
Abbreviations xii
Chapter 1 1
Chapter 2 14
Chapter 3 40
Chapter 4 72
Chapter 5 101
Chapter 6 122
Chapter 7 161
Chapter 8 184
Chapter 9 213
Chapter 10 237
Chapter 11 274
Chapter 12 291
Appendix 1 299
Appendix 2 326
Selected Bibliography 359

ABBREVIATIONS

AWRV	Antiochian Western Rite Vicariate
AOCC	American Orthodox Catholic Church
BAS	Divine Liturgy of St Basil the Great
BCP	*Book of Common Prayer*
CHR	Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom
ECOF	*L'Église catholique orthodoxe de France* (Catholic-Orthodox Church of France)
GOTR	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
GRE	Divine Liturgy of St Gregory the Great
HLS	*Handbook for Liturgical Studies*
JAS	Divine Liturgy of St James of Jerusalem
NOM	*Novus Ordo Missae*
OCA	Orthodox Church in America
PG	*Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca*
PL	*Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina*
PNCC	Polish National Catholic Church
RO	*Russian Observations Upon the American Prayer Book*
ROCA	Russian Orthodox Church Abroad
ROCOR	Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia
SASB	*Saint Andrew's Service Book*
SL	*Studia Liturgica*
SVSQ	*Saint Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*
SVTQ	*Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*
TIK	Divine Liturgy of St Tikhon
TOM	*The Orthodox Missal*
TOR	*The Orthodox Ritual*

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Western Rite Orthodoxy is most simply understood as those communities or parishes who, though sharing doctrinal unity with other Orthodox Christians, do not use the Byzantine liturgies but use one or more revisions of Western liturgies. As the name might also suggest, Western Rite Orthodoxy is primarily a 'Western' phenomenon, something which is found predominately in places where the population is Christian but not specifically Orthodox. Though Western Rite Orthodoxy's origins are in England during the middle of the nineteenth century, it has been most successful in North America, where it is a small, but not unseen, component of the Antiochian Archdiocese of North America. There have also Western rite communities in France and there are small numbers of Western Rite Orthodox in Australia and New Zealand. In its present form, Western Rite Orthodoxy owes much to debates in the twentieth century over liturgical revision, especially after Vatican II, and subsequent conflicts over women's ordination and same-gender marriage in churches of the Anglican tradition, but it has also been profoundly influenced historically by questions of how the Western Church relates to Eastern Christianity, the validity of the 1979 American *BCP* among some Episcopalians and more generally the theological developments of the West in the absence of alternative perspectives from Eastern Christianity following the Schism of 1054.

Western Rite Literature

A commonly repeated maxim among Western Rite Orthodox is that the best kept secret in the West is the Orthodox Church, and Western Rite Orthodoxy is the best kept secret in the Orthodox Church. And, to a certain extent, such a statement is true, particularly with regards to the scholarly study of Western Rite Orthodoxy. Within

journals, the literature on Western Rite Orthodoxy is scant, or at the very least is obscure and therefore difficult to find without a significant amount of personal investment in the process of digging it up. However, like many oft repeated adages, while there is a superficial level of truth, the truth is indeed much deeper. There is in fact a wide dearth of written material on the Western Rite, certainly not all of it of equal quality; some of it only provides insight into the phenomenon of Western Rite Orthodoxy by allowing a researcher to look into how the Western Rite Orthodox see themselves, even though but is not a fully vetted, peer-reviewed article. At the very least, the primary literature is there, provided one realizes what one is looking for and where to find it. One must be prepared for the challenge of forging ahead into new territory to research the Western rite, and this means knowing where to begin looking for what has already been said on the subject.

Surprisingly, there are a number of articles that are either directly related to Western Rite Orthodoxy or are of significant benefit to the study itself. Some of these articles are indirectly related, but their value becomes more apparent as the questions which surround Western Rite Orthodoxy come into stark relief. These include materials addressing subjects as diverse as ecclesiological differences between East and West, conceptions of the sacraments, and liturgical change/renewal in the Western Church, to name just a few. There are several classic studies which must be consulted in the course of any research into Western Rite Orthodoxy, notably the exchange between Paul Schneirla and Alexander Schmemann,[1] and the Western Rite debate between Andrew Sopko and Schmemann.[2] More recently, the AWRV eucharistic liturgies have been subject to scrutiny in a peer reviewed context, and in both articles, they were judged against the neo-Gallican rite of the ECOF,[3] with one receiving a brief comment from Paul

[1] Paul (William Suftin) Schneirla, 'The Western Rite in the Orthodox Church', *SVSQ* (NS) 2.1 (1958) 20-44; Alexander Schmemann, 'Notes and Comments: The Western Rite', *SVSQ* (NS) 2.4 (1958) 37-8; and Schneirla, 'The Western Rite', *SVSQ* (NS) 3.1 (1959) 36-7.

[2] John Meyendorff 'Notes and Comments: A Debate on the Western Rite', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 253-5, Andrew J. Sopko 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Case Study and Reappraisal', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 255-65, and Schmemann 'Some Notes on "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 266-9.

[3] Allyne L. Smith 'Review Essay: *Saint Andrew Service Book: The Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies According to the Western Rite Usage of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America*', *SVTQ* 41.2-3 (1997) 249-68 and Gregory W. Woolfenden, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: Some Reflections on a Liturgical Question', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 163-92.

Schneirla.[4] The most recent works include a brief overview of the main English language secondary literature[5] and a study of the epiclesis text within the Gregorian liturgy.[6] These articles appeared in a single journal series, so they are relatively easy to locate. In addition, the recent literature review is especially helpful since it covers all the important English language literature up to 2009. There are also a few Master's level theses that cover the Western Rite liturgy[7] or focus on one aspect of Western rite history.[8] One item which should be mentioned is a brief survey of Western Rite Orthodoxy, with emphasis on the history of the Western rite outside the AWRV, but notable for its reprint of Overbeck's mass.[9] Finally, there are two non-English treatments of Western Rite Orthodoxy which should not be overlooked: one detailing the history of the ECOF[10] and another providing an in-depth study of Julian Joseph Overbeck.[11]

More problematic is that the primary publishing arm of the Antiochian Western Rite Vicariate (St. Luke's Priory Press) lacks a presence in electronic media or, at the time of this writing, an appreciable printed catalogue. During the latter half of 2007, the press itself was moved from New Jersey to Spokane, Washington and taken under the supervision of Fr. Bernard Kinnick of St Nicholas Orthodox Church, though without any staff other than the parish pastor. As a result, it has been exceptionally difficult to know precisely what material is available and how one can acquire it. In addition to the official publishing arm, Lancelot Andrewes Press offers some material which is of interest to Western Rite Orthodoxy, notably an annual calendar with appropriate commemorations.

---

[4] Schneirla, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Brief Response From Within', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 193-7

[5] Jack Turner, 'The Road Thus Far: A Review of the Literature of Western-Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 53.4 (2009) 477-505.

[6] J. Turner, '"And We Beseech Thee to Send Down Thy Holy Spirit": History, Liturgy, and Theology in the Epiclesis Text of the Divine Liturgy of St. Gregory', *SL* 39.2 (2009) 202-215.

[7] Nicholas Alford, 'A Hymnal for Use in Western Rite Orthodox Churches' (D.Min. thesis. Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 2000) and Benjamin J. Andersen, 'An Anglican Liturgy in the Orthodox Church: The Origins and Development of the Antiochian Orthodox Liturgy of Saint Tikhon' (M.A. thesis, St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, 2005).

[8] David F. Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite and the Eastern Church: Dr. J. J. Overbeck and His Scheme for the Re-Establishment of the Orthodox Church in the West' (M.A. thesis, University of Pittsburgh, 1961).

[9] Günther Thomann, *The Western Rite in Orthodoxy: Union and Reunion Schemes of Western and Eastern Churches with Eastern Orthodoxy: A Brief Historical Outline* (Claremont: Anglican Theological Seminary in California, 1995).

[10] Maxime Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident: Renaissance d'une Église Locale* (Suresnes: Les Éditions de l'Ancre, 1994).

[11] Wilhelm Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie: Leben und Ziele Julian Joseph Overbecks* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).

However, the majority of the work of the press is promoting Anglo-Catholic liturgical texts, which can make the acquisition of primary documents, particularly liturgical items of historic interest, significantly more difficult. The primary liturgical texts are the *SASB*, *TOM*, and *TOR*. The *SASB* is available through commercial and Orthodox booksellers, but *TOM* and *TOR* are only available through St Luke's Priory Press and are not to be found in any library collections. The same holds true for the ROCOR *Saint Coleman Prayer Book*, which is not available to anyone outside the ROCOR's Western Rite parishes and monasteries.[12]

There are several brief and extended mentions of Western Rite Orthodoxy in a few magazines, some of which are quite helpful. David Abramtsov composed two articles describing the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy in the middle part of the last century, once in the Russian Patriarchal English-language magazine *One Church*,[13] and an updated version of the same item in *The Word*.[14] *One Church* also contains other items of interest, including Metropolitan Sergius' Ukaze permitting the reception of Louis-Charles Winnaert.[15] For the AWRV, *The Word* contains the minutes of the annual (and later, biennial) archdiocesan conventions, including reports from the AWRV, though these are of varying usefulness. There is also a single article about Alexander Turner and his parish Church published in *TIME Magazine* shortly after it was received into the Orthodox Church.[16] In a related category, parish newsletters sometimes have valuable information of an historical nature, and several of these newsletters are rather widely distributed, normally over the internet.[17] There are also a few journals which have been published by Western Rite groups, including Turner's *The Basilian*/*Orthodoxy* and Overbeck's *Orthodox Catholic Review*. These two items are the only ones where the entire run is available in a North American library as the AWRV publication *Credo* is

[12] In late 2009, an abbreviated version of the *Saint Coleman Prayer Book* was made available in Australia, but the item in question is rather difficult to acquire unless one genuinely knows where to look.
[13] Abramtsov, 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy in Modern Times', *One Church* 15 (1961) 226-36
[14] Abramtsov, 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy', *The Word* 6.4 (1962) 14-27
[15] Metropolitan Sergius, 'Western Rite Ukase', *One Church* 8.4 (1954) 18-23.
[16] 'Orthodoxy: Eastern but Western', *TIME Magazine* 83.18 (Friday, 1 May 1964) 64. There is an earlier article about the Society of St Basil which does not feature Turner and which appeared in the same publication: 'Man With a Mission', *TIME Magazine* 46.10 (Monday, 3 Sept. 1945) 73.
[17] For example, *The Lion* of St. Mark's Orthodox Church in Denver, Colorado, *St Gregory's Journal* of St. Gregory the Great Orthodox Church in Washington, D.C., and *Reunion* published by the Society of St. Basil.

only available as a broken set. Other items are only available in the United Kingdom, including *The Glastonbury Bulletin*, which is published by the British Orthodox (Coptic) Church. However, several other journals and magazines dedicated to Western Rite Orthodoxy are not available from any convenient source.

Among the primary sources available, aside from Overbeck and Turner's journal series, both of which have already mentioned above, there are a few monographs by Overbeck,[18] who was a prolific author and polemicist. There are also two biographies of Louis-Charles Winnaert, published by his ex-wife under a pseudonym.[19] Two self-published ventures are a part of the Western Rite Orthodox literature, and both items are produced by Michael Kaiser.[20] Western Rite Orthodoxy has a strong history of self-publication, notably Overbeck and Turner's journals. Turner published a number of pamphlets on Western Rite Orthodoxy, some of which are reproduced in other sources and others which are only available as pamphlets.[21] Finally, Chrysostomos Stratman's polemical pamphlet at least deserves mention, in part because it is one of the few items that are dedicated partly towards a repudiation of Western Rite Orthodoxy.[22]

There is also a considerable amount of literature available on the internet: this includes reproductions of the more important articles and original works not submitted for standard publication or peer review. Here again, these provide a useful, if limited, sources of information. Publically available sources, though of varying in academic rigour and literary quality, can often point the careful researcher towards topics or lines

---

[18] A fuller listing is available in the bibliography, but Overbeck's most important English-language work on Western Rite Orthodoxy is *Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism: A Word About Intercommunion Between the English and the Orthodox Churches* (London: N. Trübner and Co., 1866), since it is in this volume that he sets out his ecclesiological understanding of Orthodoxy and Anglicanism and promotes, in English, his plan to restore the Orthodox Church.

[19] Vincent Bourne (Yvonne Winnaert), *La queste de verite d'Irenee Winnaert: modernisme, ocumenisme, orthodoxie* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1966) and *La Divine contradiction: l'Avenir catholique orthodoxe de la France* (Paris: Librairie des Cinq continents, 1975).

[20] Michael Keiser, *Children of the Promise: An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy* (Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2004) and *Offering the Lamb: Reflections on the Western Rite Mass the Orthodox Church* (Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2006).

[21] Alexander Turner, 'An Orthodox Primer' (Mount Vernon: Society of St Basil, 1955) and 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: Its Fascinating Past and Promising Future' (Mount Vernon: Society of St Basil, n.d.), for example.

[22] Chrysostomos Stratman, 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy' (Chicago: The Orthodox Christian Education Society, 1957), though the majority of the text is dedicated to reproduction of Apostolos Makrakes' polemical writings on several subject, none of which have anything to do with the Western Rite, the first several pages are Stratman's observations on Western Rite Orthodoxy specifically.

of investigation which have gone unstudied in scholarly literature. A pertinent example of this would Aiden Keller's 'Amalfion: Western Rite Monastery of Mount Athos';[23] this one of only two available English language studies on Amalfion.[24] Thus, without this particular public source, a researcher might not ever be aware of the existence of Amalfion in any case, despite the fact that Keller's study is of little academic value. Western Rite Orthodoxy also exhibits many of the features of a New Religious Movement, in the sense that the community is small and primarily insular, especially when one considers the so-called autogenic Western Rite groups.[25]. Most AWRV parishes maintain their own website, which provides a source of primary documentation for the researcher, but much of it is of limited value due to the quality, brevity, or specificity of what is available. Certainly some materials are better than others, and these should be given their due consideration. The hazards of web-based information are widely known, especially with regards to New Religious Movements[26] and independent Catholic bishops, and there are some related concerns that must be expressed even with regards to internet research with more established groups like the AWRV.

---

[23] Aiden Keller, 'Amalfion: Western Rite Monastery of Mount Athos: A Monograph with Notes and Illustrations' (Austin: St HIlarion Press, 2002). It should be noted that the work in question was published by a group known as Saint Hilarion Press, though it would appear that most of the material published by this press was the work of Keller and thus served as a vehicle for his ideas like most other self-publishing ventures. Since the press itself is now largely defunct and the only available source of its materials is on the website of the church which house the press, it has been listed here rather than as a self-published venture.

[24] The other study is Leo Bonsall, 'The Benedictine Monastery of St. Mary on Mount Athos', *Eastern Churches Review* 2.4, (1969) 262-7. Considering that Bonsall's essay is now nearly forty years old, it is unlikely that many researchers would be familiar with the work in the first place. In the case of Keller, Bonsall's work is not credited in the bibliography, so it is possible he too is unaware of the work, though most of Bonsall's work is an English language summary of older articles in French in any case. One more recent mention of Mount Athos comes in Graham Speake, *Mount Athos: Renewal in Paradise* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); though the reference is rather scant, there is at least a nice photograph of what remains of the monastery.

[25] The phenomenon of 'linen closet cathedrals,' a derisive term for churches so small that they exist in the entirety of the primary bishop's home, is prevalent in Independent Catholic circles, with many individuals having episcopal ordination but no church to shepherd. The same phenomenon exists with some autogenic Western rite communities, which exist solely on paper or in the home of their presiding bishop or only in cyberspace.

[26] cf., e.g., Hugh Urban, 'The Devil at Heaven's Gate: Rethinking the Study of Religion in the Age of Cyber Space', *Nova Religio*, 3.2 (2000) 268-302. While the article primarily discusses the May 1997 mass suicide of Marshall Applewhite and his followers, the core discussion of technology and its usefulness to small New Religious Movements in creating community across vast distances is particularly germane to the study of autogenic Western Rite groups. See also John Corrigan, *et. al.*, 'Electronic Media and the Study of American Religion', *Religion and American Culture* 16.1 (2006) 1-24 for a more generalized discussion of the potential problems and benefits in the use of electronic media and the study of religion, particularly religious history.

In addition to the difficulties associated with actually tracking down the available literature, there are also some general problems at hand when one begins reviewing available material, regardless of its ultimate source. These problems range in scope from barriers regarding language, problems with sourcing, and issues of availability of material for scholarly review. While Western Rite Orthodoxy is primarily a phenomenon of the English-speaking world and most of the scholarly literature has been written in English, it should not be forgotten that one of the most successful Western Rite groups of the last century was the ECOF, and the literature connected with this group is almost exclusively in French.[27] Much of the scholarly literature on Amalfion is written in French as well.[28] Although other continental Western Rite Orthodox groups, including congregations in Italy and Poland, exist there is little way of knowing how much literature, if any, either of these groups produced. Additionally, though the idea of the Western rite was initially conceived and primarily carried out in the United Kingdom in the nineteenth century, Overbeck himself wrote a number of monographs in German and his petition for a Western Rite Church was addressed to the Russian Orthodox Church. Thus, for the most thorough reader, the primary languages involved in the study of Western Rite Orthodoxy include English, French, German, and Russian, among others of lesser degrees of availability and significance. The vast majority of non-English language Western rite literature remains un-translated from the language of initial composition so the scholar who wishes to study any of this material in detail will be forced to provide their own translations.

Particularly endemic of literature which is self-published is that the bibliographical citations, when present at all, are incomplete. Basic citation information such as volume of the journal or magazine a source was published in, page numbers for a quotation, or even referenced works lacking the name of an author or title of an article are

[27] The two exceptions are Francoise Fichet and Djuro J. Vrga. 'The Appearance and Growth of Orthodoxy in France', *GOTR* 22.2 (1977) 214-26 and Basil Youdell, 'The Orthodox Church of France: A Brief Survey', *ENCL* 23.3 (1986) 16-21; aside from these, I know of no other article-length treatments of the ECOF in English.

[28] These include Theodore Nikolaou, 'Un pont entre l'Église d'Orient et d'Occident: le monachisme', *Irénikon* 57.3 (1984) 307-323 and Antoine Lambrechts, 'Pèlerins bénédictins au Mont Athos', *Irénikon* 71.2-3 (1998) 281-289 as the most recent examples.

quite common.[29] That is not to suggest that these materials are of little or no value, but rather that they do not conform to the expected standards of quality normally found in a peer-reviewed article or monograph; their primary value lies in the fact that there is little directly related literature on the topic and these works can provide a starting point for the researcher to engage in more thorough scholarly research. However, there are often documentary deficiencies in public sources or self-published works and consequently potentially valuable reference material is lost to subsequent researchers due to carelessness or poor writing skills. The lack of peer-review also poses problems in terms of accountability. Other issues include almost non-existent methodology (in some instances) and matters of tone, since many self-published works are polemical or apologetic nature. The point on apologetic works bears comment since, in an effort to justify a position, problems of an historical (and sometimes theological) nature sometimes creep in. Thus, the researcher must be knowledgeable in the academic literature of the larger field so as to be able to sort out important point from gross theoretical errors, as many of these works display the particular biases of their authors.

Furthermore, most libraries, even those with substantial theological collections, will have little or no material related to Western Rite Orthodoxy, and those that do will only have one or two items scattered across the assorted volumes. In some instances, materials are mislabelled or improperly categorized in the collection database, even in highly reputable libraries.[30] Monographs published before the 1950's are often difficult to acquire, particularly if they were not published in the researcher's country of study. Articles in scholarly journals are easier to locate and more likely to be owned by at least

[29] This is especially true of Thomann's bibliography. It is also endemic of literature which appears in magazines such as *The Word*. A specific example is in Schneirla, 'The Twain Shall Meet', *The Word* 37.5 (1993) 3, which mentions *The Orthodox Catholic Review* as published by the Antiochian Archdiocese, but with no specific reference to the title of the article or even the month or year the article was published. One suspects that Schneirla may have been mistaken concerning the publisher of the journal since Overbeck published a journal under similar name though there is no reference to that journal in any of the historical material of Archdiocese that I have found.

[30] One personal experience was in attempting to locate a copy of Overbeck's Western Rite Mass. When the volume was found in the collection of the Newberry Library in Chicago, Illinois, it was described by the library as being 'for the use of Anglo-Catholics.' Overbeck himself would no doubt have been infuriated were he alive to see something of that sort today. I state all of this not to bring disrepute on any institution or collection, but rather as a means of emphasizing the point that literature related to Western Rite Orthodoxy is often unknown in purpose or scope when outside the hands of individuals with direct knowledge of Western Rite Orthodoxy. Thus, a researcher must be cautious before dismissing literature based solely on the description provided in a library catalogue.

some institutions, but articles in popular magazines or in journals published by the interested parties are more difficult to locate. The latter problem is especially frustrating to access as these are not normally indexed in reference manuals.

Finally, there is the matter of primary literature, specifically the journals published by Julian Joseph Overbeck and Alexander Turner entitled *Orthodox Catholic Review* and *Orthodoxy*, respectively. Both series are important to the historical progress of Western Rite Orthodoxy. The *Orthodox Catholic Review* presents a very intimate portrait of Overbeck, providing insight into his developing thought on Orthodoxy and the relationship between the Western rite and the larger Orthodox Church, as well as a timeline of his struggles to develop a Western Orthodox Church in the late nineteenth century. His articles are direct and candid in that he is quite open with regards to his opinions on Anglicanism and the Old Catholic Church. Turner's periodical also provides more insight into his developing theological opinions, though of a less intimate sort than Overbeck's articles. However, *Orthodoxy*, and *The Basilian* as it was known during the first five volumes, is more important for the progressive historical information it provides on the state of Turner's small group of parishes during their time period of 'canonical limbo' after the repudiation of the American Orthodox Catholic Church and Turner's admission to the Syrian Archdiocese in the 1960's. Also important from an historical perspective, though only related to the AWRV, the annual (and later biennial) minutes of the Archdiocesan convention published in *The Word*, which provide rather mundane details like the number of functioning parishes, their names and locations, and similar information; such material is certainly less spectacular, but by no means unimportant.

Why This Study?

Western Rite Orthodoxy is a subject which has generated interest beyond what its numerical size would suggest. The number of Orthodox Christians worldwide is commonly estimated as 210 million, with six million actually resident in the North America.[31] It is commonly claimed among Western Rite Orthodox that the number of

[31] For example, see Timothy (Kallistos) Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin Books, 1997), 6-7 for worldwide figures on Orthodoxy.

Western Rite faithful in North America is around 20,000.[32] Taken as a percentage, Western Rite Orthodoxy comprises 0.33% of all Orthodox Christians in North America and around 0.0075% of Orthodox Christians worldwide. However, while Western Rite Orthodoxy comprises only a fraction of Orthodox in the world, and indeed the majority of Orthodox Christians in the West have never even heard of 'Western Rite Orthodox', it nevertheless remains a definitive reality and has, at various periods, received a larger profile in Western Europe and North America than its numbers might otherwise command, whether in a positive or negative sense.

Theoretically, the obvious question is what, if anything, within the Western rite is incompatible with Orthodox theology or spirituality. Certainly, its assumed answer is behind every apology or polemic of Western Rite Orthodoxy, and the struggle for an answer to that question is present in the debates over the theoretical legitimacy of Western Rite Orthodoxy, most notably in the pages of *SVTQ*. The problem with previous approaches to the question has largely been that they are concerned with the theoretical aspect only. Previous studies which have approached this question have done so with what might appear to be a disregard for the actual existence of the Western rite. Alexander Schemann's support for and critiques of Western Rite Orthodoxy are admittedly theoretical, concerned with the Western rite in abstract rather than as it was actually implemented. There is value in this approach, but in some ways it neglects to consider Western Rite Orthodoxy as an existing phenomenon. This is perhaps an oversight, but it is one that should be rectified, and in part, the present study looks at Western Rite Orthodoxy not only in abstract but also in terms of how Western Rite Orthodox perceive themselves in reality. In that way, the underlying premise behind posing the question above is not one of whether or not Western Rite Orthodoxy is legitimate or not. Western Rite priests are in communion with Orthodox bishops who are in turn in communion with other Orthodox bishops and thus, at least on a very basic level, Western Rite Orthodoxy can be said to be 'legitimate'. Instead, the underlying premise of this work will be a consideration of how Western Rite Orthodoxy is actually

[32] See Milkovich 'Western Rite Orthodox: Its History, Its Validity, and Its Opportunity: Interview with Paul Schnerlia', *The Russian Orthodox Journal* 63 (November, 1990) 10.

made manifest and the natural consequences that derive from the way in which it has been realized.

While that is the central question, there is an equally important question which has largely gone ignored, specifically is the Western rite still Western? At first, this may seem to be something of a truism. Obviously Western Rite Orthodoxy is Western: it declares as much right there in the name. Nevertheless, the liturgies of Western Rite Orthodoxy have been altered for multiple practical and theological reasons. In addition, the liturgical rites used by the Western Orthodox are largely unaffected by the liturgical developments subsequent to Vatican II, either by accident or, most often, by design. It has been nearly fifty years since *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was issued and less than forty years since the Mass of Pope Paul VI was published, sparking liturgical reform in a number of Western churches. As a consequence, a significant number of Roman Catholics and Anglicans no longer recognize the liturgies that the Western rite churches use as the Western rite. Since the Western rite is supposed to be familiar to Western converts to Orthodoxy (and thus make Orthodoxy intelligible to a Westerner), one should certainly question whether the use of a liturgy rarely celebrated for three to four decades can really be called familiar, especially for those who were born after the liturgical reforms of the latter twentieth century. Such questions have serious implications for the future of Western Rite Orthodoxy as presently constituted.

Structure and Scope

Western Rite Orthodoxy does not exist in a vacuum; rather, it is an outcome of two processes at work in the history of Christianity. The first process, which is broadly Western, involves the meeting of the Eastern and Western Churches and their attempts to relate to one another liturgically, theologically, and politically. We find traces of this process in the various conflicts between the Eastern and Western Churches throughout Christian history, as well as in the various attempts to establish visible unity after it was severed in the eleventh century. This process affects the way Western Christians view the Orthodox Church, whether it be at the Council of Ferrara-Florence or in Tübingen, though each community in the example provided had their own reasons for approaching the East. Liturgically, the Christian East has contributed to the West in numerous ways,

large and small, to form the Roman rite, with the Eastern Church's liturgical life taken into account more consciously in the liturgical reforms following Vatican II.

The other significant process is narrower and involves the Anglican Church and those later bodies which are influenced by it, like the Old Catholics and various Independent Catholic bodies. Here, we see a process of individual Western communities looking at their own liturgy and seeing it as deficient in one form or another. This naturally leads to the question of how that liturgy should be modified to address the concerns. While Anglicans had recourse to Western sources to alter their liturgy, and frequently made use of these sources, they also had recourse to the Christian East and the liturgical tradition there, both as a means of showing where the Anglican liturgy was deficient and ways it could be successfully modified. This seems natural since many Anglicans have expressed an affinity for the Eastern Church, recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a sister Catholic Church, even when that affinity was not returned.

Western Rite Orthodoxy is the inheritor of these long histories, particularly the latter given that a large number of Western Rite Orthodox, historically or presently, have been members of an Anglican Church directly or were related to it in some way before coming into Orthodoxy. Consequently, the decisions which have been made about Western Rite Orthodoxy have been made with these processes lurking in the background, along with assumptions about the liturgy, dissatisfaction with Western Christianity, and the confused ideas about Eastern theology held by the Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Independent Catholics, and other who became the pioneers of Western Rite Orthodoxy. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the case of the 'founder' of Western Rite Orthodoxy, Julian Joseph Overbeck, or the most successful Western rite body, the AWRV. Naturally, this requires an in-depth look at the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy, specifically AWRV and the Western rite work of Overbeck; the liturgies used in Western Rite Orthodoxy, including the liturgies themselves, their Western antecedents, and the problems inherent in the liturgies as they presently exist; and the problems that Western Rite Orthodoxy presents more generally. We will consider each of these issues in turn, though it is important to remember that they are all inter-related.

The present work is limited in some respects. First, while an overview of the entire history of Eastern and Western interrelationships could be valuable, particularly for

those who are unfamiliar with the intricacies of ecclesiastical history with regard to the schism and its antecedents, as well as attempts to repair the breach by Roman Catholics and Protestants at various times, only the briefest overview is necessary since this has already been covered extensively elsewhere. Additionally, and especially insofar as liturgical rites are concerned, the present work does not consider all of the various manifestations of Western Rite Orthodoxy historically, though Chapters 2 and 3 provide some of this history as a helpful background to the reader. Primarily, the present work is concerned with Western Rite Orthodoxy as it is practiced in the United States in the twenty-first century, further limited to the manifestation of the Western rite in the AWRV. Liturgically, more consideration is given specially to the Tridentine rite and the 1928 American *BCP* since both of these were ultimately adopted and adapted by the AWRV to become the Western rite.

CHAPTER 2
JULIAN JOSEPH OVERBECK

'For a thousand years, the West was Orthodox,' or so is stated, in varying ways and forms, by many introductions to or apologies for Western Rite Orthodoxy.[1] While this is correct in a manner of speaking, it is also deceptive in its simplicity. The Christian East and the Christian West certainly shared a common faith and *communicatio in sacris* with one another, but even this does not suggest the very real differences between the two sides developing in important areas like theology and ecclesiology.[2] While it is arguable that open schism was not inevitable, and indeed was a long time in coming to fruition,[3] differences and outright rivalry between the two preeminent sees of Christendom, Rome and Constantinople, begins early on and schism itself is not far off. The actual history of the Great Schism of 1054, and its antecedents, have been sufficiently described in other places that they do not need to be rehearsed here;[4] suffice to say that relations were not irreparably sundered, nor did East and West cease all contact with one another, as is demonstrated by the presences of Latin monasteries on Mount Athos after the schism and

[1] Alexy Young, 'An Introduction' and Michael D. Trigg, 'Our Plea' in Michael D. Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy* (Ben Lomond: Conciliar Press, 1993), 7, 28 respectively; and Keiser, *Children of the Promise*, 2-3, serve as relevant examples.

[2] See Henry Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church: From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); George Every, *Misunderstandings Between East and West* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966); Tia M. Kolbaba, *Inventing Latin Heretics: Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2008); and John Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450-680 A.D.* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989) for more specific discussions of conflicts between Eastern and Western Christianity which precede and contribute to the Great Schism.

[3] This is the conclusion of most recent histories which treat the schism; however, see Kallistos Ware, 'Orthodox and Catholics in the Seventeenth Century: Schism or Intercommunion?" in Derek Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 259-76 where he describes instances of inter-ecclesiastical cooperation among Orthodox and Catholics as late as the seventeenth century, though obviously the evidence he presents can only be taken so far.

[4] Cf, e.g., Andrew Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681-1071* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007); Aidan Nichols, *Rome and the Eastern Churches: A Study in Schism* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992); Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches During the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955); Malon H. Smith, *'And Taking Bread…' Cerularius and the Azyme Controversey of 1054* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1978)

the sack of Constantinople in 1204.[5] Likewise, attempts at healing the breach, both between the Roman Catholic Church and Orthodoxy and Orthodoxy and the various churches of the Reformation, are also readily rehearsed by others.[6]

However, even though all of this relates to Western Rite Orthodoxy, it is not what we typically think of when we consider Western Rite Orthodoxy, which does not genuinely arise until the nineteenth century. Until this point in history, what has been called Western Rite Orthodoxy has primarily consisted of groups who wished to unite themselves to the Orthodox Church but who presumed that their ecclesiastical and theological life were already compatible with Orthodoxy. However, those who attempted to enter into such Church unions did not mean that their previous ecclesiastical affiliation would be rejected. By way of example, the Nonjurors understood themselves to be the remnant of the English Church; intercommunion with the Orthodox would mean recognition of their legitimacy as a Church. By contrast, with the latter part of the nineteenth century, we see a new development wherein Western Christians adherents first renounce their previous ecclesiastical loyalties to join with the Orthodox Church while simultaneously seeking approval for their particular liturgical rites. The two models continued alongside one another up to the present time, but it is the latter which is most appropriately called Western Rite Orthodoxy in the modern era. This new form of Western Rite Orthodoxy begins with the particular ecclesiastical vision of a single individual: Joseph Julian Overbeck.

The Beginnings of Modern Western Rite Orthodoxy

Overbeck was born in the lower Rhineland on 24 April 1821. Very little is known about his early life, except to say that he was born into a Roman Catholic home with

[5] Bonsall, 'Benedictine Monastery on Mount Athos', *Eastern Churches Review* 2.1 (1969) 262-7.

[6] See Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968) for a general overview of the period. See also Ernst Benz, *Wittenburg und Byzanz* (Fink: Munich, 1971); Wayne J. Jorgenson, 'The *Augustana Graeca* and the Correspondence Between the Tübingen Lutherans and Patriarch Jeremias' (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1975); George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982); and Arthur W. Turfta, 'Lost Opportunity Yet Seed-Bed for Later Dialogue: Council of Ferarra-Florence' (D.Litt diss., Drew University, 2007) for specific studies of the Lutheran experience and Georges Florovsky 'Orthodox Ecumenism in the Nineteenth Century', *SVSQ* 4.3-4 (OS) 2-53; Vasileios T. Istavridis, *Orthodoxy and Anglicanism in the Twentieth Century* (London: Faith Press, 1963); Leon Litvack, *J.M. Neale and the Quest for Sobornost* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); and Judith Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2003); for relevant examples for the Church of England.

ultramontane leanings, and by his own later account, his parents were very strict Catholics.[7] He received his advanced education at the University of Münster and was ordained as a Catholic priest in September of 1845. He eventually transferred to the University of Berlin, where he studied Oriental languages and presented his doctoral thesis entitled '*Commentarius grammatico – literalis in Geneseos* ep. III 1-7.'[8] From 1853 to 1857, he was a member of the theological faculty at the recently formed University of Bonn. It was during this period at Bonn that he made contact with several future leaders of the Old Catholic movement and would pay a visit to the city of Rome, though the latter experience left him largely unimpressed.[9] At some point during this period, Overbeck began to have doubts about his adherence to the Catholic Church, and in a short note to the theological faculty, he abandoned his lectureship. He was disturbed by several Roman Catholic doctrines, and later cited the extra-biblical origin of the doctrine of purgatory and Petrine supremacy as motivating his departure from Rome.[10] Shortly afterwards he married Josephine Walb, abandoned his Roman Catholic ordination and became a Lutheran.[11] To provide for his family in the absence of a lectureship, Overbeck received a personal stipend from King Frederic Wilhelm IV for Syriac studies at the British Museum.[12] By the early 1860's, Overbeck had arrived in England, receiving a brief appointment to the University of Oxford and a small stipend, and later to the General Staff College, Royal Military Academy at Woolwich as a linguist.[13]

During this period, Overbeck also spent a significant portion of time researching the authentic Syriac writings of St Ephraim the Syrian. He published his research in Latin in 1865. Religiously, he seems to have taken up the Protestant ethos quite fervently, commenting on the superiority of Protestant evangelical devotion when compared to the mechanical external actions displayed by Catholics.[14] However, he also felt that Protestant theology lacked an awareness of both the catholic nature of the Church and

[7] Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 10-1, 17.
[8] Ibid., 12.
[9] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 4.
[10] Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 43.
[11] Ibid., 15-6.
[12] Ibid., 17n1.
[13] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite,' 4, and Peter F. Anson, *Bishops at Large* (London: Farber and Farber, 1964), 49.
[14] Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 46

genuine connection to the Church's historic tradition, and was increasingly troubled by both problems. This, combined with a concern over separation of the various Protestant churches from one another, left him dissatisfied with Protestantism.

During his preparation of the St Ephraim translations, Overbeck undertook a more thorough study of the Orthodox Church. Simultaneously, Overbeck had begun to contemplate the problem Christian divisions and how to resolve them; eventually he concluded that the Orthodox Church was the only genuine Church and that the only way to overcome disunity was to submit to an Orthodox ecclesiastical authority.[15] Overbeck also began writing polemical works, first against the Roman Catholic Church and later the Church of England. His first work was *Die Orthodoxe Katholische Anschauung im Gegensatz zum Papsttum und Jesuitismus Sowie zum Protestantismus*, which contained very little discussion of Protestantism, despite the title. His first direct attack on the Anglican Church would come in 1866 when he published *Orthodox Catholicism and Anglo-Catholicism: A Word About Intercommunion Between the English and Orthodox Churches*. Overbeck consistently mentions 1865 as a 'decisive year' in his encounter with the Orthodox Church.[16] By this time, he was living in London and made the acquaintance of the Orthodox chaplain at the Russian embassy, Eugene Popoff.

Popoff is an interesting figure who deserves decidedly more attention with relationship to the history of Orthodoxy in the West than he generally receives. Popoff spent several years as the chaplain of the Copenhagen embassy after earning a degree from the St Petersburg Spiritual academy in 1835. Popoff had been considered as a candidate to become Bishop of San Francisco, but had declined the opportunity to accept assignment as the chaplain to the London Embassy in 1842, a post he would hold until his death in 1875. He owed his initial appointment to confusion created by Palmer during his visit to Russia; Count Pratassov felt that there was insufficient knowledge of the Anglican Church and the issues raised by Palmer, so it was deemed expedient to send someone to England who could study her ecclesiastical life and make policy recommendations to the Governing Synod.[17] During his time in London, Popoff was an active observer of English religious life and made frequent reports to Russian Governing

[15] Overbeck 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871), 45.
[16] Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 20.
[17] Florovsky, 'Orthodox Ecumenism in the Nineteenth Century', *SVSQ* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956) 22.

Synod about events within the Church of England. Initially, he held positive views of the Established Church and expected that reunion would indeed be possible, but as time went on he was more cautious about Anglicanism as a body and reversed his initial expectations with regard to intercommunion. Popoff was also an acquaintance of John M. Neale, one of the most important scholars of Eastern Christianity in England during the nineteenth century.[18] Following Overbeck's conversion, Popoff would be instrumental in helping him promote his Western rite idea within the Russian Orthodox Church, translating some of his polemical writings into Russian and ensuring their circulation, and even accompanying Overbeck on his trip to St Petersburg.

By the time Overbeck met Popoff, he had already decided to be received into the Orthodox Church, but desired to be received into a Western form of the Church rather than by conforming to the Eastern rite in Russian or Greek, and to petition to be received in his priestly rank. Overbeck envisioned the restoration of the Western Church as it had been before 1054, a re-establishment of Orthodoxy's Western form that had been lost when the papacy defected from the Greek Church. Both notions were problematic because Overbeck had already been ordained a priest in the Roman Catholic Church and during this period it was the common practice of the Russian Orthodox Church to receive Roman Catholic converts as legitimately ordained if they were already priests; the matter of rite was obviously problematic as well, since there was no Orthodox Western rite at the time. In Overbeck, Popoff had encountered a situation which went beyond the limits of his authority, so Overbeck's reception was deferred to acquire an appropriate answer to his requests, particularly his reception as a priest. The matter was deferred to the *Oberprocurator* of the Russian Governing Synod, Count Dimitry Andreevich Tolstoy, who also received a Russian translation of Overbeck's apologetic works.[19] Tolstoy in turn referred the matter to Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow on 17 July 1865, with a simultaneous instruction to Popoff to delay until both had heard from Philaret.

The delay was not long as on 25 July an answer was provided to Tolstoy. Addressing the matter of Overbeck's marriage after ordination, Philaret concluded that this would be an absolute impediment to his reception as a priest. Because he had already

[18] Litvack, *J. M. Neale and the Quest for Sobornost*, 53 ff.
[19] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 5.

been legitimately ordained in the Roman Catholic Church, it would be impossible for him to exercise priestly office because his marriage incurred the penalty of automatic deposition from the clerical state, and he had entered into the clerical state with the expectation that he would remain celibate for life in any case. In a subsequent letter on the subject, Philaret would reply that he would be theoretically willing to receive Roman Catholic clergy who had married after leaving the Roman Communion but before becoming Orthodox, provided they were never allowed to become bishops,[20] but in any event he remained cautious, not wanting to cause undue scandal within the Orthodox hierarchy or disturbance among the laity. Overbeck's petition to be received into the Orthodox Church via the Western rite lacked sufficient specificity to be considered workable. Nevertheless, Philaret found reception of Overbeck to be desirable as a convert.[21]

Despite the initially negative response, Overbeck was not deterred in his quest to re-establish the Western rite within Orthodoxy. Furthermore, Overbeck felt that the Russian Church was still the appropriate avenue to bring his vision to fruition:

> Russia seems providentially placed as a connecting link between the East and the West. Russia is more familiar with Western Christendom than other Orthodox countries, since it has to deal with millions of Roman Catholic and Protestant subjects. Therefore it is more alive to the real and true state of religious affairs, and cannot so easily be duped into the rosy view of Anglican Intercommunionists. The good people of Greece and Constantinople had a bona fide belief in what some Anglican Ultras told them respecting the English Church, and in more than one instance compromised themselves and their Churches. The Russians were not so easily to be led astray…. The Russian Church is more cautious, and at the same time more active and stirring than any of her sister Churches, therefore we associated with her, and, we are happy to say, she has more than fulfilled our expectations.[22]

He also began appealing to friends and the public in an attempt to gain adherents to his future Western Orthodox Church. Finding a sufficient number of like-minded supporters served two purposes: first, Overbeck felt that a large group would be more difficult to ignore than a lone individual and secondly that the initial group would form the

---

[20] Philaret, *Pis'ma Mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta k' A. N. M....1832-1867* (Kiev: Tip. J. i. A. Davidenko, 1869) 641.
[21] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 5.
[22] Overbeck, 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 47-8.

motivated core to attract further adherents once a Western rite was operational.[23] The petition was circulated in a number of languages besides English, including German, French, Latin, Greek, and Russian, though most of the eventual signatories were English speaking. To promote the Western rite idea, he also founded a serial entitled the *Orthodox Catholic Review* in 1867, the first English periodical devoted to Orthodox Christianity.

Throughout his work, Overbeck protested that his scheme was not aimed exclusively or even directly at the Established Church, and we can conclude he sincerely believed this since he attempted to circulate his ideas widely. Overbeck states that there were Roman Catholics and Dissenters among his converts,[24] but there can be no doubt that the majority who subscribed to his views were members of the establishment, including a few clergy. One of these clerical converts published an anonymous pamphlet containing Overbeck's petition and a scathing attack on the Anglican Church. It enumerated the most serious defects of the Church and then proposed that the only sensible course was to leave the Church of England and join Orthodoxy via the Western rite.[25] That an Anglican clergyman was the author of this pamphlet should itself come as no surprise as there was ample reason for Anglicans to secede from the Church of England during this period, especially those of High Church or Ritualist leanings. Secession from the Church of England seemed to be the logical result of a firm commitment to the Anglo-Catholic party as illustrated by the conversion of several important Tractarians to the Roman Catholic Church in the middle of the century. Growing discontent among the upper and middle classes with Ritualism in the latter part of the nineteenth century could be seen as another opportunity to push out those who might be favourably disposed towards joining Overbeck's petition, especially after the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874; few Ritualists would actually desert the Church even after the passage of the act, and all of the Ritualists who left went to Rome in any case.[26]

---

[23] Overbeck, 'The True Old English Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 9 (1880) 10-1.
[24] Overbeck, 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 48
[25] Cf. Anon., 'The Present Crisis'. Abramtsov suspects that the author is A. V. Richardson, though this is not demonstrated conclusively.
[26] John S. Reed, *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), 238ff.

Ultimately, Overbeck was able to acquire 122 signatures for his petition. Feeling that this was sufficient to carry forward with his plans, Overbeck was officially received into the Orthodox Church at the Russian embassy on 21 June 1869. In September of the same year, he forwarded the petition to the Governing Synod for their approval. A commission was established by Metropolitan Isidore Nikolsky of St Petersburg, consisting of the Metropolitan as chair, Popoff, Overbeck, Professor John T. Osinin, and Archpriest Joseph Vasilev.[27] The first meeting was set for December of the same year, and Overbeck was given the opportunity to defend his position before the whole Synod, which reacted favourably to his overture. Once initial approval was secured, Overbeck was given the task of producing an appropriate liturgy for a potential Western Rite Church. Overbeck used the current Tridentine rite, making some changes, and sent the liturgy to the Synod in 1870.[28] The text that Overbeck provided the Synod contained only the eucharistic liturgy since Overbeck believed it expedient to have the central liturgy in place for the health of his movement, deferring the adaptation of the other sacraments and the office for a later date.[29] The proposed liturgy was also accepted by the Governing Synod without emendation. However, before the Synod would actually authorize the liturgy for more than theoretical use, Overbeck's petition was circulated among the other Orthodox Churches for their judgment.

Simultaneously, events on the continent were having an effect on ecclesiastical life north of the Alps with the convocation of the First Vatican Council in 1869, culminating in the declaration in the dogma of Papal infallibility *ex cathedra* in 1870. Vatican I was the result of a long process in strengthening Papal authority since the Council of Trent three centuries earlier. The Papacy had experienced a particularly low ebb in the earlier part of the century, but after Napoleon's defeat in 1815 and the subsequent attempts to restore France to its pre-revolutionary state, the Papacy

---

[27] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 13

[28] Among the differences, Overbeck eliminated '(1)The kneeling down, worshipping, and elevation of the elements after the words of institution have been recited….(2)The form of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, 'Supra quae propitio,' etc., being rather mutilated in the Roman canon, we substitute the unexceptionally full form of the Mozarabic Missal (Dom. V. in Quadrag.). (3)We advise the use of leavened bread, for a *practical* reason….(4)The addition of the *filioque* is to be removed from the Creed' (Overbeck, 'The Western Uniate Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 1 (1867) 196). The eventual mass approved by the Synod would retain *Supra quae propitio* and insert an epiclesis from CHR rather than the Mozarabic rite (cf. Overbeck, *Liturgica Missae Orthodox Catholicae*, 16).

[29] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 14

experienced gains due to Gallicanism having been severely undercut by the reorganization of the hierarchy during the Napoleonic era. The resurgence of Ultramontanism in several parts of Catholic Europe also aided the Popes as they sought to increase their direct authority over the affairs of local dioceses. Pope Pius IX's declaration of the Immaculate Conception as a *dogma de fide* in 1854 without aide of an Ecumenical Council anticipated the later prerogative of Papal Infallibility proclaimed at Vatican I by *Pastor Aeternus* on 18 July 1870. The growth in Papal authority, though it spanned several centuries of development, was not acceptable to everyone within the Roman Catholic Church (though none of the bishops who opposed the declaration of infallibility went into schism after it was proclaimed), particularly in Germany. Small groups of German, Austrian, and Swiss Catholics entered schism with Rome and joined with the Church of Utrecht in the Netherlands, which had been independent of Rome since 1723. This group subsequently became known as the Church of the Utrecht Union or more popularly as the Old Catholic Church.

Overbeck was familiar with many of the leaders among the German Old Catholics before the official break with Rome in 1871. Most of the leadership came from Catholic academics in Germany; Overbeck had worked with several of them during his time at the University of Bonn and generally held the individuals he already knew in high regard. In the secession of the Old Catholics from Rome, Overbeck sensed an opportunity to add numerical strength to his Western Orthodox Church, and so followed the developments at the first Old Catholic Conference in München in 1871.[30] Overbeck also corresponded with Johan J. von Döllinger, who had invited him to attend the München conference as an observer. Overbeck was heartened by the openness to union with the Orthodox Church which was displayed by several speakers at the conference, most notably Fredrich Michelis,[31] but was simultaneously dismayed that the Old Catholics wished to attempt to remain in communion with the Roman Church while working out their differences. Such a position was unacceptable to Overbeck who recommended that they simply sever all ties to Rome, as was already becoming inevitable, and submit to Orthodoxy.[32] By the following year, the Old Catholics had already begun to move towards schism through the

[30] Abamstov, 'The Western Rite', 17.
[31] Ibid., 16
[32] Ibid., 17.

establishment of separate Old Catholic parishes. There were further developments that would subsequently begin to disturb Overbeck, including suppression of individual confession and the failure to renounce Trent. There was also the matter of Döllinger's hostility towards the Russian Church which Overbeck felt was unjustified and would move the Old Catholics away from Orthodoxy.[33] Nevertheless, Overbeck felt that as long as they had not directly rejected the Orthodox Church there was still reason to feel they might abjure Western errors and join him in his petition for a Western Orthodox Church.[34]

The Old Catholics were committed to a reunion of the various parts of Christianity through the establishment of committees to discuss the problems related to ecclesiastical union. This impetus eventually manifested itself in 1874 and 1875 at a series of conferences in Bonn between the Old Catholic, Anglican, and Orthodox Churches to work out their differences and hopefully restore communion between the various groups. The expectations were certainly high, but there was little doubt in many minds that the differences could be worked out and that all sides could come to a common confession of the Christian faith based on the precedent of the first millennium. Even Overbeck, who normally looked askance at matters of Church reunion, was at least hopeful that something might have been worked out.[35] But Overbeck approached the matter with caution. In his view, the choice to invite Anglicans was an unfortunate one since it legitimated their status as a Church, even though they were in reality no such thing.[36] Not only so, but the majority of attendees were from the High Church party, including prominent members of the Anglo-Catholic movement. Representation from the Evangelical and Broad parties was decidedly lacking, thus providing a distorted picture of the Church of England. He felt that the best path would have been for a conference exclusively between the Orthodox and Old Catholics, creating doctrinal consensus between Old Catholics and Orthodox first and then inviting the Anglicans when they could present a unified front against the Protestant innovations of the Church of

[33] Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 132-4.
[34] Overbeck, *Die Wiedervereinigung der morgen- und abendländischen Kirche* (Halle: H. W. Schmidt, 1873).
[35] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 20.
[36] Ibid., 21.

England.[37] Nevertheless, invitations went out to theologians from a variety of backgrounds, the majority drawn from Old Catholic, Anglican, and Russian Orthodox bodies, and a smattering of Danish Lutherans thrown in for good measure; there was even a Congregationalist minister invited to the 1874 Bonn conference.[38]

The majority of this first conference was split between Anglican-Old Catholic discussions on the one hand, and Old Catholic-Orthodox discussions on the other. There were several individuals who participated in the conference who felt the Anglican-Old Catholic discussions were naturally drawing the latter towards the former and away from Orthodoxy.[39] This was perhaps best underscored by the major work of the conference, which was a working document of fourteen points showing where Old Catholics and Anglicans disputed with one another on matters of doctrine; there was no comparable result between Orthodox and Old Catholics. The conference had addressed the matter of the *filioque*, but Anglican intransience, especially that of Edward Pusey, meant the clause was left in the creed.[40] The Anglicans and Old Catholics eventually crafted a statement, rejected by the Orthodox, which stated the *filioque* was 'illegal' and that 'the whole Church should set itself seriously to consider whether the Creed could possibly be restored to its primitive form, without sacrifice of any true doctrine which is expressed in the present Western form.'[41] At no point were ecclesiology and the number and nature of the ecumenical councils effectively discussed, much to the disappointment of Overbeck and much of the Orthodox contingent, who felt that ecclesiology should be the natural starting point in any conversation on Church reunion.[42] The second conference, meeting a year later, returned to the question of the *filioque*, but this time all parties proved to be more inflexible than before and no real progress was made. No further reunion conferences were held, though Döllinger had plans to hold one.

[37] Ibid., 19.
[38] C. Beaufort Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement* (London: S.P.C.K., 1977), 268.
[39] J. H. Morgan 'Early Orthodox – Old Catholic Relations', *Church Quarterly Review* 152.2 (1951) 8.
[40] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 269.
[41] Ibid., 262-3.
[42] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 20.

In current and modern accounts, including those by Liddon,[43] Douglas,[44] Moss,[45] and Florovsky,[46] Overbeck has commonly been cited as the chief agitator against reunion at the conference and his intransient on the matters of doctrine is regarded as primarily responsible for turning the Orthodox against the Old Catholics. Nevertheless, there was already a significant amount of trepidation regarding the Old Catholics on the part of the Russian delegations to both conferences, and certainly on the matter of the *filioque* the Anglican delegates were equally unmoved. A more balanced evaluation finds that all three sides were probably not ready to meet one another on the question of Church union in any case. Overbeck's resolute opposition to grant a hearing to the Anglican concerns probably did not aid any other Orthodox delegates in approaching their concerns abstractly. But the Anglicans were exclusively motivated by recognition of their Catholicity as a first principle to discussion; any criticism of their doctrinal positions on matters importance to the Orthodox without that recognition was destined to fall on deaf ears. Furthermore, many within the Ritualist camp were still entertaining eventual union with Rome and did not wish to make a move which would disrupt their ultimate goal. Finally, the Old Catholics themselves had only recently emerged from the Roman Catholic Church and so there were still many questions left unsettled, especially with regards to their relationship with their former communion. It was only at the 1874 conference that Trent was definitively renounced as in discussions, but that rejection was still controversial, especially with Utrecht.[47]

It should also be remembered that the Declaration of Utrecht was still fifteen years away, and until that time that the German and Swiss Old Catholics would not have

---

[43] Henry P. Liddon, 'Letter to Dr. Döllinger', and 'Letter to Sir Robert Phillimore', *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (London: Logmans, Green, and Co., 1904), J. O. Johnston (ed.), 190, 207, respectively.

[44] John A. Douglas in Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations* (London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1931), 34-35n.14. Overbeck is specifically included among those who were responsible for 'retarding that impartial and first hand investigation' by Orthodoxy into the Anglican Church and Overbeck for specifically successfully rendering the 1874 reunion conference 'inconclusive.'

[45] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 270. Citing Liddon, Moss regards Overbeck as the initial cause for the failure of the conference, followed shortly by the Russo-Turkish war and the animosity between the English and the Russians resulting thereafter.

[46] Florovsky, 'Orthodox Ecumenism', *SVSQ* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956) 37-8. Florovsky regards Overbeck as 'the other unfavourable factor' because '[Overbeck] did not sympathize with any other proposed manner of Catholic reconciliation,' though such a judgment does not take into account Overbeck's earlier expectations for the Old Catholic movement and his deep disappointment with what he perceived to be a slide towards Protestantism.

[47] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 262.

a firm dogmatic agreement with the Utrecht Church, and thus have something tangible that could be presented to outsiders. In the end, Overbeck himself did very little to change the opinion of those Orthodox who were already in favour of the Old Catholics, some going so far as to state that the Old Catholics were Orthodox simply by their secession from Rome.[48] Thus, Overbeck's place in the failure of the conferences, while not neutral, was not nearly as significant as has been suggested. He functioned more along the lines of a 'squeaky wheel', pointing out that which was objectively clear: there could be no union unless one side ceded dogmatic ground, and no one was willing to budge in the slightest.

The attempt to bring the Old Catholics into union with Orthodoxy had failed. The loss of the Old Catholics in 1875 came at a very low time for Overbeck. He had begun to despair of ever receiving official sanction for a Western Rite Church, even to the point of no longer accepting signatures for his petition. In addition to his inability to attract the Old Catholics, Overbeck was experiencing other problems in England. Archbishop Alexander Lykourgos had visited Liverpool in 1870 to consecrate a Greek Church there, and was warmly received by the Anglicans. Though Overbeck would claim that Alexander had privately read the petition and praised its Orthodoxy,[49] the public face that he put forward was very different than the one Overbeck used. In the process of being entertained by the Anglicans, he was prepared to negotiate with all representatives of the Established Church. Though he had defended the Orthodox position on the *filioque*, the number and authority of the Ecumenical Councils, and the ban on marriage after ordination, he was at least willing to conclude that the Church of England was 'a sound Catholic Church, very much like our own', which was separated from the East by misunderstanding that could be corrected by friendly dialogue.[50] The seeming duplicity between Overbeck's approach and that of the Archbishop caused confusion among Overbeck's followers, many feeling that the Establishment could not be heretical given how warmly the Archbishop had spoken of it, and so they were induced to return to Anglicanism.[51] Several others had also abandoned Overbeck, returning to or joining the

[48] Florovsky, 'Orthodox Ecumenism', *SVSQ* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956) 38.
[49] Overbeck, 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 48.
[50] Florovsky, 'Orthodox Ecumenism', *SVSQ* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956) 29
[51] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 27

Anglican or Roman Catholic churches when no movement on the petition was forthcoming; others emigrated or simply disappeared without further reference, and eventually individuals began to die. The first of Overbeck's converts to die was John Allen Baxter, who died on 3 May 1879 in Ludlow.[52] Tragedy would strike in 1875 when Eugene Popoff died at the Russian Embassy. His replacement, though respectful of Overbeck, was not enthusiastic about the idea of a Western Rite Orthodox Church.

After the failure of the Bonn conferences, Overbeck again looked to negotiations with the various Orthodox Churches for approval of his petition. In 1876 he addressed an appeal to the heads of the local Orthodox Churches pleading with them to authorize his petition.[53] He took great pains to outline the desperate situation in which those who looked for a Western Orthodoxy found themselves, hoping that this would induce the bishops to provide relief through their approval. However, such approval was not forthcoming as Overbeck's initial letter was never answered. That itself was not unexpected as the eastern Mediterranean had entered a tumultuous period at the beginning of the century. The Greek War of Independence had made life increasingly difficult for the Patriarch of Constantinople.[54] The patriarchate itself changed hands no fewer than twenty-four times between 1822 and 1876. Furthermore, the various wars for independence and secession movements in the Balkans created their own host of ecclesiastical complications in the region. The political dimension was no better with the outbreak of the Crimean War (1853-66) and the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78). Any hope that the Patriarchs under Ottoman domination would consider granting concessions to what was a very small movement in a faraway place was a remote possibility at best.

In August of 1879, Overbeck resolved to take matters into his own hands and travelled to Constantinople in an attempt to settle the subject once and for all. At the Phanar, he found broad sympathy for his plans to restore the Western rite to the Church, including the Patriarch Joachim III the Magnificent. Overbeck also made a request that his priestly ordination be recognized as well, though for this there was significantly less support. The members of the synod were perplexed by this inquiry since they did not

---

[52] Ibid., 29n99.
[53] Overbeck, 'An Appeal to the patriarchs and Holy Synods of the Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 5 (1876) 276-88.
[54] Cf. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 407-12.

recognize his priestly ordination as valid in any case. Under Greek practice, Overbeck's marriage was not an impediment to exercising priestly office because he was never a priest at all. Furthermore, members of the Synod informed him that the Russian Church was capable of deciding this matter independently and the Greeks would have accepted whatever decision was made. Several of his associates attempted to persuade him to accept the declaration of his Roman Catholic orders as void so that he could be ordained anew, but Overbeck felt such a course would be sacrilege and so refused to consider the possibility.[55] However, Overbeck did receive permission from the Patriarch to open an oratory in his own home for the education of Western Orthodox youth until such time as the Western liturgy was approved and a priest commissioned for the flock. A committee was also appointed to provide a more detailed judgment on Overbeck's petition and the proposed liturgy.[56]

Thus, while the result was certainly not as positive as he may have desired, Overbeck did have renewed cause for hope. He began calling for those who supported a Western Orthodox Church to demonstrate their support by coming forward to sign the petition.[57] The patriarchal committee decided in early 1882 that Overbeck's petition was acceptable and that it could receive the Patriarch's approval pending a positive consensus from the other Churches. But by this time Overbeck's plans had largely collapsed. No further Orthodox Churches granted their approval, and there is speculation that the Church of Greece actively blocked the petition. In 1884, Eugene Smirnov recommended that the Russian Governing Synod quietly drop the matter.[58] The figures provided in the *Orthodox Catholic Review* show that no more than a dozen or so were still clinging to Overbeck's plans,[59] though there were at least some followers who persisted in Orthodoxy well into the next century.[60] The last issue of the *Orthodox Catholic Review* was dedicated to a translation of Peter Mogila's *Confession* in 1885, later published as a

[55] Kriéeff and Overbeck 'An Account of the Visit of Dr. Overbeck to Constantinople in 1879', 2-3
[56] Ibid., 3-4.
[57] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 26.
[58] Florovsky, 'Orthodox Ecumenism', *SVSQ* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956) 32.
[59] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 26
[60] Cf. Douglas in Papadopoulos *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*, 35 n14, where he states that at the time of his writing (1931) some of Overbeck's followers are still around, though these are likely the children of his original adherents and not the initial adherents themselves given the fact that it had been nearly fifty years since any practical work had been done with regards to the Western rite, and thus it was unlikely that these were new converts.

separate volume in 1898. This would be Overbeck's last publication as he died quietly in 1905 at the age of 84. Except for a brief notice in the *London Daily News* on 3 November which mentioned only his work as a linguist, no official notice was taken, and he was buried in the Embassy Church cemetery five days later. His dream of a Western Rite Orthodox Church seemed to have died with him, though Overbeck's vision would find a measure of success several decades later in the United States, which will be the subject of the next chapter.

Overbeck's Vision, Opponents and Associates

Overbeck's version of Western Rite Orthodoxy was unique from previous attempts at reuniting Eastern and Western Christianity in that it started from the premise that Western ecclesiastical institutions as they existed were beyond redemption and that 'authentic' Western Christianity had simply ceased to exist. In other words, there *was no* Western Church to reunite with Orthodoxy because there was no Western Church. What there was of the Western inheritance could be restored, but only within the context of the Orthodox Church. Thus, Overbeck seeks in many ways to lay the modern Western Church overtop the life of the Eastern Church, producing a Western liturgy with an Eastern canon law and sacramental discipline. For Overbeck, the most important factor was fidelity to true Christian doctrine. External differences of rite were of secondary concern since there had been a variety of practices in the early Church and no one ever thought them sufficient cause to break communion.

Overbeck believed that his movement would be best served were it to start small and grow naturally into a larger body. Though he did wait until he had a number of interested individuals before submitting his petition to the Russian Governing Synod, the group was still only the size of a small parish rather than a full national Church. Overbeck himself viewed this small initial foundation to be the correct path. In his vision, the original group would have existed as a collection of associates who met for private devotions without sacramental ministrations until the time that a priest could be validly licensed or ordained for the group.[61] Nevertheless, he did not envision that his Western

[61] Overbeck, *Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism*, 198-200.

Orthodox Church would remain small, and indeed he had a grand vision of what the future would look like for Western Orthodoxy:

> Our aim is much more comprehensive. We wish to restore the Western Church, of which, of course, the Orthodox Anglican, the Orthodox Gallican, the Orthodox Italian, etc. will form parts or National Churches, like the Orthodox Greek, the Orthodox Russian, the Orthodox Serbian etc. from the component parts of the Eastern Church.[62]

How precisely one was to move from a small body to multi-national Western Orthodox Churches is never explicitly set forth, either in mundane matters of organization or the more practical matter of where and how to acquire faithful for these Churches, but Overbeck certainly believed that it could happen.

Initially, one would think that the best means of establishing a Western Orthodox Church would be to bring about some form of union between a Western Church and the Eastern Churches, much like what was attempted by the Lutherans and the Nonjurors. The first obvious place to turn would have been the Roman Catholic Church, though this was unlikely to result in any success and Overbeck himself was hardly expectant that Rome would confess its errors and rejoin Orthodoxy. Indeed, his opinion of the Papacy is so low that despite his disapproval of Anglicanism he still views Rome as the 'common enemy' of Anglicans and Orthodox alike, and attempted on several occasions to convince the Establishment that it would be better to lose converts to a benign Orthodoxy than to a hostile Rome.[63] For Overbeck, Rome was to be avoided at all costs not simply because of the heretical *filioque* or the teachings on the supremacy of the Pope, but because the Pope seeks to unite all Christians under himself in the name of increasing papal power, not promoting true doctrine. The *Syllabus of Errors* (1864) issued by Pius IX is used by Overbeck to describe the doctrinal ambivalence of the Papacy in the face of increasing its own authority.[64] But, the harshest vindictive is reserved specifically for the Jesuits, whom Overbeck treats as the embodiment of all that is wrong with the Papacy, based in part on their exclusive loyalty to the Pope. Thus, Overbeck was not prepared to expect a sudden reunion between the Roman Catholic Church and Orthodoxy and instead looked for individual

[62] Overbeck, 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 47-8
[63] Overbeck, 'On the Impossibility of Union', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 5 (1876) 66.
[64] Khale, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 98.

communicants to succeed from Rome and accept the Orthodox Faith. As far as practical matters, Overbeck was not short on the things which Roman Catholics must repudiate, but they notably included: denial of 'papal novelties', indulgences, purgatory, use of statues, the repudiation of the *filioque*, and interference in politics, among others.[65] Every development which took place after the Great Schism was to be set aside in favour of returning to a pure form of Western Orthodox Catholicism.

In Overbeck's view, there was no hope for a union between the Anglican Church and the Orthodox Church, either. He was well aware of the various constituencies within the Church of England and that the presence of multiple doctrinal opinions, often times contradictory in spirit, was a consistent criticism of the Established Church. For that matter, though High Church Anglicans were felt to have retained more of the deposit of faith than the Evangelicals, these individuals remained in communion with bishops or priests who taught doctrines contrary to the apostolic tradition and thus forfeited their own claim to legitimacy.[66] He felt that two Churches which do not share a common doctrinal agreement cannot be communion with one another, and for that matter the internal situation of the Church of England was so doctrinally elastic that he was unsure whether or not it could be termed a Church in any case.[67] Thus, without the ability to win a large, pre-existing ecclesiastical body to Orthodoxy, Overbeck expected that genuine Christians would join the Orthodox Church, but they would have to do so individually, or that dissatisfaction with the main body would become so great that large numbers would simply leave, with Overbeck's Western Church in communion with Orthodoxy ready to receive them.

Overbeck thus reveals himself to be something of an idealist in that he simply seems to have expected converts to come once they were aware of these developments. In his mind, there was no question that the majority of Christians were disaffected with their church life. That is not surprising since Overbeck formulated his ideas during a period of time when significant convulsions were affecting the Church, the two most relevant of which we have already had occasion to mention. He held out great hope that

---

[65] For a complete list, see Overbeck, *Die Rechtgläubige Katholische Kirche* (Halle a/A: H. W. Schmidt, 1869), 821-3.
[66] Overbeck, 'The True Old English Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 9 (1880), 3.
[67] Ibid., 3.

if only Orthodoxy was available to Westerners in a familiar form, true Catholics would gladly secede from their heretical communions and join the Orthodox Church. And yet, despite the possibilities offered by Overbeck's scheme, there was no significant movement towards union with Orthodox and consequently a Western Orthodox Church, though union attempts were offered rather half-heartedly by the Old Catholics prior to the Bonn conferences. There was always opposition to Overbeck, even among those whom should have been his closest allies, partly because of his insistence on doctrinal uniformity with Orthodoxy (leading many to suggest that he was intolerant and approaching Church union in an untenable manner[68]) and partly because of the confused ecclesiological circumstances among both Old Catholics and Anglicans.

Overbeck seems to have encountered no serious opposition from the Roman Catholic Church, and there is little evidence that Roman authorities were even aware of his activities in any case. Even if they had been aware, there would have been little to be done since Overbeck resided in England and was otherwise out of reach of the official censure of the Government because of his convictions vis-à-vis Orthodoxy and Catholicism. The Old Catholics also do not seem to have provided significant opposition to Overbeck, partly because they were concentrated in areas not associated with Overbeck's work partly because they entered the scene at the time when the Western Orthodox Church had simply stalled. The main source of opposition Overbeck experienced came from the Anglican Church. Though Overbeck was opposed by virtually all Anglicans who were aware of his activities, he particularly raised the ire of those within the High Church party. For Anglo-Catholics, Overbeck represented a very real threat to their understanding of their own Church. Anglo-Catholics, and Tractarians before them, had proposed that the Catholic Church is composed of various branches: English, Greek, and Latin.[69] The major scandal was not that there were three branches of the Church, but that they were not in communion with one another and were separated by misplaced hostility. Most of the Anglo-Catholics felt that the Orthodox Church had misunderstood the Anglican Church as merely another Protestant body rather than a true

[68] Cf., e.g., Olga Novikoff, *The MP for Russia: Reminiscences and Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (London: Andrew Melrose, 1909), Two Vols., William T. Stead (ed.), Vol. 1, 144 and Edward Pusey, 'Introductory Essay', in Frederick J. Lee (ed.), *Essays on the Re-Union of Christendom* (London: T. J. Hayes, 1865), p. xxxix-xlii.
[69] Litvak, *J. M. Neale and the Quest for Sobornost*, 40-2.

Catholic Church. This was the opinion of William Palmer when he visited Russia, though he experienced a rude awakening when he found the Russians did not share his perspective.[70]

For High Church Anglicans and the ecclesiastical leadership of the Church of England, Overbeck represented the attempt of one Catholic Church to unlawfully poach on the jurisdiction of another. By directly attempting to make converts of English subjects rather than minister exclusively to Easterners sojourning in England, Overbeck specifically and the Orthodox Church generally was effectively stating that it did not regard the Established Church to be a genuine Catholic Church, something that could only be interpreted as a grave affront to relations between the two bodies. On more than one occasion, Overbeck himself was accused of fomenting schism within the Church of England, a charge he took as absurd.[71] However, Overbeck himself felt that the Church of England should have been grateful for the existence of a Western Orthodox Church since those Anglo-Catholics who had remained within the Anglican Communion would be willing to defect to a Western Orthodox Church. Furthermore, the Western Orthodox Church presented those Anglo-Catholics who would otherwise be inclined to head for the mutual enemy of the Roman Catholic Church with an alternative.[72] The argument was hardly convincing.

On the other hand, Overbeck was not alone in attempting to introduce Orthodoxy to England specifically and to the West generally. We have already noted that Popoff was a source of a number of converts to the Orthodox Church in England and Denmark, and had been sent to England specifically to observe the Anglican Church. Equally eager to plant Orthodoxy in England was Timotheos (Stephen) Hatherly, an Anglican convert to the Greek Orthodox Church who was eventually ordained as a priest in Constantinople. Hatherly celebrated the Byzantine rite, working mainly in West England (Wolverhampton) and Wales (Cardiff). Though he was officially forbidden to 'proselytize even a single member of the Church of England',[73] Hatherly received several converts, including two who assisted him in translating the liturgy into English, and was

[70] Ibid., 45-6
[71] Overbeck, 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 48.
[72] Overbeck, *Orthodox Catholic Review* 5 (1876) 279
[73] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 54.

eventually promoted to protopresbyter for his missionary work. Overbeck and Hatherly were clearly aware of one another as Overbeck feared the latter might use his name to gain support from the Russians for the Eastern rite missions.[74] For that matter, both clearly desired the same thing in persuading as many members of the Establishment to join the Orthodox Church as was possible. However, the two men were working at similar ends through entirely different means. Overbeck sought to recreate the Western Church in all of its historic glory, including in the liturgy, while Hatherly merely wanted the liturgy to be celebrated in English. And, for that matter, for Hatherly, there was no Christianity that was not in some way Eastern and more specifically Greek.[75] Hatherly also shunned the same kind of publicity for himself and his movement that Overbeck actively sought. This did not make Hatherly any less critical of Anglicanism or authorities in the Church of England any less opposed to his activities, but it did allow him to work on ministering to his tiny flock of converts and native Greeks. In the end, Hatherly's efforts went the way of Overbeck's as his followers dispersed after his death, leaving little trace of his activity, save for his translations of the liturgy.[76]

Yet Overbeck was not without his sympathizers. The most important ally was likely Popoff because of his closeness to the Governing Synod, but equally important for Overbeck was Olga Novikoff, who became something of an unofficial Russian ambassador to England, and her brother Alexander Kiréev. Overbeck maintained a lively correspondence with both individuals, especially after Novikoff arrived in England. Novikoff was equally impressed with Overbeck and thought highly of his desire to reinstitute an Orthodox Western rite. When he was maligned by Henry Cotterill, Bishop

---

[74] Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 70-1. Overbeck actually feared that any approval of Hatherly's activities would result in an unmitigated disaster for his own work. Just before going to Moscow in 1869, Overbeck lamented to an associate in a personal letter that 'if they had approved of [Hatherly], then my scheme is *irreparably defeated* and my going to Russia is utterly useless. Two rival Orthodox Churches, one with the Eastern Rite, and the other with the Western Rite—such a state of things would be utterly intolerable', (Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 71n.1, emphasis original).

[75] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 52

[76] Ibid., 55-6. There is still a Greek Orthodox Church in Cardiff (St Nicholas), which was founded by Greek seamen, may have been a result of Hatherly's ministry in the area, though they certainly did not follow his vision of an Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom composed of English converts and using the English language, as the parish only recently began using English in their services. Ironically, Hatherly is remembered as a 'valiant poineer' of Orthodoxy in England while Overbeck is largely forgotten as seen in Markarios Tillyrides, 'Orthodoxy in Britain: Past, Present and Future' in John Behr, Andrew Louth, and Dimitri Conomos (eds.), *Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West: Festschrift fo Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 150-1.

of Edinburgh, as 'a very low type' who had 'brought over to the Orthodox Church the intolerance of the Roman Communion to which he had previously belonged', Novikoff emphatically stated that Cotterill had misjudged Overbeck and his theological insight.[77] Overbeck was also associated with Athanasius Richardson who had converted to the Russian Church independently of Overbeck, but eventually joined with him in the Western rite petition. There were several others who feature prominently in Overbeck's writings, including in the pages of the *Orthodox Catholic Review*, but many of whom preferred the anonymity of their initials to open identification with Overbeck and his plans.

Overbeck's Failure: An Evaluation

There were a number of reasons why Overbeck's petition failed to make genuine headway. Overbeck himself made no secret of his belief that the Church of Greece had wrecked his plans at the instigation of the Anglican Hierarchy. There is at least a grain of truth to his claim. Most Anglicans were hostile towards Overbeck as they viewed the establishment of a Western Church in their jurisdiction as an act of ecclesiastical aggression. It was indeed one thing for there to be Churches belonging to another national Church located in England for the purpose of ministration to immigrant population, but to have an indigenous Church in communion with the Orthodox Church that was not the Established Church of England was unthinkable. Overbeck's plan struck at the very heart of Anglican ecclesiology, which viewed itself as the only legitimate Catholic Church in Britain. Overbeck himself consistently relished the controversy he was generating and was alternately infuriated when Orthodox dignitaries gave lip service to Anglican pretensions. Even though Overbeck's movement was small, it represented an overt and existential threat to Anglican self-understanding in their early ecumenical endeavours, so it seems only reasonable that those in a position to change the circumstances would do so if possible. Greece was deeply in debt to the United Kingdom, and there were familial ties between Queen Victoria and King George I. It is not

[77] Novikoff, *The MP for Russia* I, 144-5.

impossible that the Archbishop of Canterbury could have exerted pressure on the Greek Church to oppose Overbeck.[78] But there may be other reasons for the failure of the plan.

In the first place, there was a substantive failure to acquire support for the scheme. Though Overbeck possessed grand dreams for the future Western Orthodoxy, he nevertheless realized the practical importance of beginning small. However, his movement never grew very much. The original petition contained 122 signatures, and it does not seem that Overbeck was ever very successful in winning any additional converts to his cause, despite an intensive lobbying campaign through his books, periodicals, and his presence at various reunion conferences. Part of this is at least related again to politics, but this time political relations between Russia and Britain. The Crimean War was still within recent memory when Overbeck began his work, and there were still underlying political tensions with Russia. Overbeck himself was aware of the political problems, and was consistently forced to remind potential converts that politics was not the role of the Church.[79] His repeated protests that once the church was stable enough to support three bishops they could be independent of Russia demonstrates both Overbeck's own naiveté on the matter and just how much association with Russia was considered a liability.

Furthermore, even if Overbeck did not see the possibility Russia making a political move through a Western Orthodox Church, many of Overbeck's opponents did, and his work was labelled 'Russian propaganda' by what Overbeck countered was an 'enraged Anglican Intercommunionist'.[80] The Russian connection was damaging to Overbeck's goals in Britain. For that matter, Overbeck himself as an active controversialist may have been too abrasive an individual to win converts by his personal attractiveness. Many of the Anglicans who were present at the Bonn conferences held very hostile opinions towards Overbeck. Furthermore, as the Church of England was the Established Church, there was little chance that many on the higher rungs of the social hierarchy would be willing to forfeit their place in respectable society for Overbeck's

[78] Cf. Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 29-30, where he makes the argument for British pressure on the Greek Church quite forcefully.
[79] Overbeck, *Orthodox Catholic Review* 6 (1877) 144, and 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871), wherein he directly states that 'all those who took the trouble of reading the wording of our petition know that not the slightest allusion is made to politics, that no one who wished to sign the petition would be examined on his political Creed.'
[80] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 12.

ideals.[81] The suffering encountered by the Ritualists and their sympathizers is an excellent example of what could await any member of the Establishment who threw their lot in with Overbeck. On the other side of politics, there is also the matter of the quiet abandonment of the plan by the Russian Synod. Douglas was certainly of the opinion that the failure of the petition could be placed directly at the feet of Russian foreign policy.[82] Novikoff blamed simple inertia rather than deliberate planning,[83] but either way at least one of the people closest to Overbeck was of the opinion that politics was the cause of petition's failure.

Equally important was that Overbeck had difficulty holding on to the converts he did win. Because Overbeck could not be ordained nor would he renounce his previous ordination and be re-ordained, the nascent Western Orthodox Church in Britain was left without any clergy. Overbeck did the best as he was able, but with no approved rite and no one ordained to celebrate the rite, the petition remained only a future possibility. However, several of Overbeck's associates had converted already under the presumption that restoring the Western rite would be a speedy and straightforward process, only to be disappointed when negotiations dragged on for nearly two decades before the matter was quietly dropped. In desperation some simply gave up and returned to the Anglican Church while others never really became very Orthodox at all. Overbeck himself was concerned with the possibility of losing the allegiance of young people if they could not be properly educated in their faith and attempted to provide catechetical training,[84] but here again the lack of practical legs for what they had converted to would prove to be to their undoing. In the end, even Overbeck's own family was widely reported to have been Protestant,[85] which serves to demonstrate the lack of stability within the movement.

---

[81] Overbeck himself specifically refers to the unwillingness of clergy to convert based on their ties to their parish benefices, or as he specifically states, for fear of losing the 'loaves and fishes' (Overbeck, 'Reconsideration of the Anglican Claims', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1971) 8.

[82] Douglas in Papadopoulos *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*, 35 n14.

[83] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 31.

[84] Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite', 25.

[85] Cf. Overbeck 'Addresses to the Young', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 11 (1885), 58-9. It is sometimes speculated that Overbeck's family did not convert with him. This is incorrect, since Overbeck himself states that his wife and children also converted to the Orthodox Church. In an 1870 letter to Olga Novikov, he states directly that, 'Yes, now we are all members of the Orthodox Church... The liturgy was for the first time celebrated in English, and an English sermon by Mr. Popoff concluded the solemnity. We were all so happy, particularly Mrs. Overbeck. She joined the Church on the 15/27th' (Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 24-5n.6). Abramtsov, who identifies N.O. as Olga Novikov, asserts that Overbeck's family 'had so strayed

Finally, the mass defection of Roman Catholics and their submission to Orthodoxy never materialized. The defection of that Overbeck expected did occur, and despite initial high hopes for union,[86] this body that came to be known as Old Catholics would not integrate with any other Church. Even more distressing for Overbeck, these Old Catholics were unwilling to repudiate many offensive Western doctrines, including the *filioque* and the number of ecumenical councils, belying Overbeck's initial estimation of the Old Catholics and their leaders. Furthermore, as demonstrated during the Bonn conferences in the 1870's, the Old Catholics had already begun to gravitate towards the Anglican model of ecclesiastical life, which Overbeck considered to be a fatal error given his earlier repudiation of Anglicanism. Without this large base of potential support on the continent, Overbeck's dream of a widespread Western Orthodox Church was destined to never materialize.

Ultimately, Overbeck's proposal was simply ahead of its time and lacked the necessary personality to shepherd the scheme through to completion. None of the above factors by themselves would have ruined the plan on its own, yet all of them taken together produced the circumstances for failure. Furthermore, Overbeck's own vision of how to proceed with the Western rite program was somewhat rushed as he sought to capitalize on the shifting ecclesiological changes as a result of Vatican I and the lead up to the Public Worship Act, 1874. The result was a poorly planned concept to incarnate a larger-than-life dream that, had it been delivered, likely would have been stillborn. Overbeck's own vision was even grander than what his Orthodox addressees were willing to support; while Overbeck consistently speaks of restoring the pre-schism Western Church, the Patriarchs and Metropolitans he petitioned more often spoke of establishing a parish.[87] Georges Florovsky correctly concludes his summation of Overbeck's career by observing that 'there was an obvious utopian element in the scheme….And yet it was not just a fantastic dream. The question raised by Overbeck was pertinent, even if his own

---

from the faith that it was thought not even Orthodox' (Abramtsov, 'The Western Rite and the Eastern Church', 31).

[86] In a letter to Döllinger before the Bonn Conferences, Overbeck goes so far as to state that 'Den Papisten un Anglikanem gegenüber (für die ich jene Notwendigkeit behauptete un *noch jetzt behaupte*) können ja die Altkatholiken schon als unsere orthodoxen Glaubensbrüder betrachtet werden, da nur das Schlußsiegel zur Union fehlt und auch dieses von ihnen herbeigewünscht wird' (Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie*, 49, emphasis original).

[87] Cf. Overbeck, 'The True Old English Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 9 (1880) 14.

answer to it was confusedly conceived. And probably the vision of Overbeck was greater than his personal interpretation.'[88] In the end, Overbeck's vision would come to fruition, but not in his lifetime and not on nearly as grand a scale as he had envisioned it.

[88] Florovsky, 'Orthodox Ecumenism', *SVSQ* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956), 32-3.

CHAPTER 3
WESTERN RITE ORTHODOXY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Though Overbeck's plans had resulted in failure, his vision of Western Rite Orthodoxy did not die out entirely. The Western rite idea would be carried forward into the next century, with varying degrees of success and fidelity to the framework established by Overbeck, but it would nevertheless continue. Even before Overbeck's death, attempts at creating a viable Western rite were already underway in North America, even though none of these early non-British attempts would bear much success. However, the lessons learned from Overbeck's failue would be implemented by his indirect successors, and in this manner, all modern forms of Western Rite Orthodoxy owe their existence to him. Without his experiences, it is doubtful successful Western Rite Orthodox bodies like the AWRV would have existed, even though they exist on a much smaller scale than what Overbeck originally envisioned.

Further Attempts to Create a Western Rite Orthodoxy

The history of Western Rite Orthodoxy in North America begins not with a specific attempt to re-establish a Western Orthodox Church as Overbeck had attempted, but with the ecclesiological adventures of one of the more famous Independent Catholic bishops. Joseph René Vilatte, who began as a Roman Catholic layman and became, successively, a Presbyterian minister, an Old Catholic priest, a Russian Orthodox priest, a Syro-Malabar bishop, and finally a Roman Catholic layman again, and is the source of at least twenty different Independent Catholic bodies in the United States. His story is as colourful as it is unusual, and is sufficiently available from other sources that it need not be repeated here.[1] Vilatte's connection to the Russian Church begins when he sought to be ordained as a missionary bishop for the Old Catholic Church in North America against

[1] Cf. Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 91-129.

the wishes of the Charles Grafton, Episcopal Bishop of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, who had supported Vilatte's work to this point[2]. When Grafton succeeded in turning the Old Catholics in Utrecht against Vilatte, he appealed to Bishop Vladimir of the Russian Orthodox Diocese of Aleutian Islands and Alaska in 1890 for ecclesiastical sanctuary. Vladimir officially recognized Vilatte as his priest in a circular letter dated 9 May 1891[3] Vilatte's association with Vladimir did not last very long and by the end of the year he was already on his way to Ceylon to receive episcopal consecration from the Syro-Malabar Church.[4] Vilatte's consecration was disputed, and none consecrated in his line have been able to definitively prove his consecration; furthermore, even though the Metropolitan of Ceylon admitted Vilatte's consecration as a fact, the Jacobite Church has not committed itself one way or the other.[5] His tenure in the Orthodox Church had been so brief that the validity of his priestly ordination was never effectively settled, nor was the issue of rite. Nevertheless, Vilatte continued to use his Western liturgy and probably exercised his priestly functions during this period, meaning that the first real celebration of the Western rite by an 'Orthodox priest' in nearly eight hundred years took place in North America, even though the circumstances and the subject were highly irregular and most probably illicit in any case. Vilatte himself, after several misadventures, finally reconciled with the Roman Catholic Church in 1925, remaining at the Abbey of Pont Colbert near Versailles until his death in 1929.[6]

Equally short-lived and ineffective was the brief union between Arnold Harris Mathew and the Orthodox Church between 1911 and 1913. Mathew was born in 1852 to a Roman Catholic father and an Anglican mother, and originally studied for the Anglican priesthood, but was put off by the attitude of Alexander Ewing that he was entered the Roman Catholic Church in 1876 and ordained a priest the next year.[7] Mathew served a number of parishes in dioceses throughout England until finally renouncing his Roman Catholic faith for Unitarianism in 1889 and informally returning to the Anglican Church

[2] Ibid., 99-104.
[3] Ibid., 103
[4] Henry R. Brandreth, *Episcopi vagnates and the Anglican Church* (London: SPCK, 1961), 51
[5] Ibid., 51-2.
[6] Ibid., 54.
[7] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 156-8.

in 1890.[8] Between 1898 and 1907, Mathew undertook no ecclesiastical activity, instead settling down to a life of publishing and other financial adventures; though he had been married in 1892, Mathew seems to have returned to the Catholic Church, he was technically excommunicated due to his 'civil' marriage after ordination.[9] By 1907 Mathew was in correspondence with a former Roman Catholic priest named Richard O'Halloran, who convinced Mathew to be consecrated as bishop by the Old Catholic Church in order to establish an Old Catholic Church in England; though the number of interested individuals was subsequently revealed to be very small, the Old Catholics in Holland viewed Mathew as having acted in good faith and upheld his 1908 consecration, allowing him to continue as a missionary bishop.[10] By 1910, Mathew had declared himself independent of the Dutch Old Catholics and consecrated two ex-Roman Catholic priests as bishops without informing the Archbishop of Utrecht.

Mathew, because of his claims to aristocratic descent,[11] was well known among the social elite and associated with individuals who figured prominently in Overbeck's Western Orthodox Church, including Olga Novikoff. She eventually suggested that Mathew seek assistance, first from the Holy Synod of Moscow as Overbeck had done, and then from Archbishop Gerasimos Messera of Beirut when the reply from Moscow was negative.[12] Archbsihop Gerasimos had come to Britian in 1911 seeking financial assistance from the Patriarch of Antioch, though without much success. Novikoff, along with her friend Baroness Nathalie d'Uxkull, introduced the two Archbishops on 15 August 1911, and it was agreed to create a formal ecclesiastical union between Mathew's English Catholic Church and the Patriarch of Antioch. Mathew subsequently described his organization as the Western Catholic Church, in a faint echo of Overbeck nearly forty years earlier.[13] Mathew subsequently appealed to and was received into communion by Patriarch Photios of Alexandria in 1912, and explicitly permitted Mathew to continue

[8] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 158-60. Anson describes Matthew's ecclesiastical wanderings in very negative terms, though Brandreth (*Episcopi Vagantes*, 16) is more generous, describing the same events as 'unfortunate circumstances' and no fault of Matthew's personally.
[9] Ibid., 161-6.
[10] Brandreth, *Episcopi Vagantes*, 17-8. Though at the time his consecration was allowed to stand, by 1920 Matthew was regarded as having intentionally deceived the Dutch Old Catholics so that they consequently regarded his consecration as null, along with all his episcopal acts.
[11] Matthew widely publicised his status as the *de jure* Earl of Landaff.
[12] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 185
[13] Ibid., 187.

using the Western liturgy if he would omit the *filioque*. However, both unions were short lived in practice, though neither prelate ever formally suspended communion with Mathew. Trouble arose when Mathew when he lost a libel suit he brought against the Times Publishing Company in 1913, making him a laughing stock in the press.[14] Further trouble was waiting when the Archbishop issued a decree forbidding his priests to be members of theosophical societies, which cased most of his clergy to abandon Mathew and form the Liberal Catholic Church in 1915.[15] With his wife petitioning for divorce, Mathew was reduced to poverty and died in 1919.

Both these very brief attempts at establishing a Western rite in Orthodoxy were thoroughly unsuccessful and had little impact beyond a few weeks and months. Another small and seemingly unimportant event would transpire at the turn of the century, though unlike Villette's and Mathew's short-lived 'unions', it would bear fruit several decades later. The subject was Tikhon (Bellavin), commonly cited as a proponent of Orthodox ecclesiastical unity in North America and for his missionary outreach in the New World. In many ways, Archbishop Tikhon displayed extraordinary vision and prepared Orthodoxy in America for many of the challenges the twentieth century would bring. It was under his leadership that a new cathedral was opened in New York City, which also featured services in English.[16] He also maintained friendship with several Episcopalian bishops, most notably Bishop Charles Grafton of Fond du Lac, an individual particularly invested with high church sympathies. Tikhon was present at the consecration of Grafton's bishop co-adjutor in 1900 in what later came to be called an exercise in 'ritual anarchy', but which nevertheless made a positive impression on Tikhon.[17] At some point during this period, Archbishop Tikhon was approached by some Episcopalians about the possibility of coming into the Orthodox Church while still retaining the 1892 American *BCP* as their rite. The primary motivation for and source of the petition is not truly known. The *RO* state that the inquiry proposed 'if an entire parish with its minister should leave Anglicanism to join the OCA, then would it be possible to authorize the "Common

[14] Ibid,. 188-9.
[15] Gary Ward, Bertil Persson, and Alan Bain, *Independent Bishops: An International Directory* (Detroit: Apogee Books, 1990), 264.
[16] Constantine J. Tarasar, *Orthodox America* (Syosset: Orthodox Church in America, 1975), 97.
[17] Peter Haskell, 'Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Grafton (Part One)', *SVSQ* 11.4 (1967) 199-201.

Prayer Book" for their liturgical use',[18] which suggests that a parish had indeed approached Bishop Tikhon with just such a proposal. However, it seems equally possible that the question was prompted by Bishop Grafton, who provided Tikhon with a number of books prior to his 1903 journey to Russia and who himself was interested in union with the Orthodox Church. Certainly, given the events at the 1900 ordination attended by Tikhon and the subsequent furore in the Episcopal Church over the conduct of the liturgy, such an inquiry does not seem wholly out of place.

The 1892 American *BCP* was provided to a special commission of the Holy Synod headed by Bishop Sergius of Yamburg. The commission was originally constituted to resolve questions related to the Old Catholic Church, but was expanded in 1903 to consider questions proposed by Anglicans.[19] The committee gave Tikhon's inquiry their due attention and, upon examining the copy of the prayerbook provided, rendered a conclusion that can only be described as mixed. On the one hand, the committee agreed to extend conditional ordination to former Anglican clergy and permit them to use the *BCP*,[20] but observed that there were several corrections which must be made to the text of the prayerbook to make it acceptable for Orthodox use. The published observations did not necessarily make specific demands, thought they did provide general principles as to the types of necessary corrections, additions, and emendations, leaving the practical solutions to Tikhon himself to work out in the United States.[21] The report was published in Russian in 1904 as 'Zamechaniya ob' Amerikanskoi "Knige' Obshchkh Molitv"' in *Khristiyanskoe Chtenie* and later translated into English in 1907 in the United States and 1917 in Great Britain.[22] However, no Anglicans were ever received by Tikhon into the Orthodox Church with permission to continue to use a corrected prayerbook, and so the matter quietly subsided.

There are at least two other Western Rite establishments which are relevant to the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy, in part because they still constitute a portion of the canonical Orthodox Church today, albeit without the Western liturgy. The first is the Polish National Catholic Church (PNCC) in Poland. The PNCC was originally founded

[18] *RO*, 1
[19] Peter Haskell, 'Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Grafton (Part Two)', *SVSQ* 12.1 (1968) 4.
[20] *RO*, 19.
[21] Ibid., 35.
[22] Ibid., p. v.

in 1897 by Franciszek Hodur as a reaction against the predominately Irish North American Roman Catholic hierarchy's opposition to Polish traditions and lay control of parish property.[23] After World War I, the PNCC was able to establish a mission in Poland, eventually attracting around 50,000 members before the German invasion of 1939.[24] The PNCC in Poland was opposed by the dominant Roman Catholic Church and the government of Poland, which made circumstances for the PNCC exceptionally difficult, even to the point that marriages performed in her churches were not recognized.[25] In order to abate some of their difficulties, at least part of the Church under the leadership of Fr. Andrew Huszno attempted to align itself with the Orthodox Church of Poland, though it wished to retain its own liturgy. Negotiations were begun in 1926, with several prelates from the ROCA contacted for their opinion and consent. The group, which was to be known as the Polish Orthodox National Church, was received corporately on 8 August 1926 by Alexis Grodno.[26] At six parishes and five priests, the movement was never very large, but it was sustained for over a decade. The body was essentially exterminated by Nazi persecutions in 1939-40.[27] Equally short lived was the Czechoslovak Orthodox Church's use of the Western liturgy. This Church had been formed from a split with a group that had already broken from the Roman Catholic Church, with the majority becoming more akin to the Old Catholics and the other, under Matthias (Gorazd) Palvik moving in the direction of Orthodoxy. The new Church used the Western rite for a brief period before switching to the Byzantine rite.[28]

One group which has not been mentioned yet but which deserves further consideration, though it is not an attempt to establish a form of Western Rite Orthodoxy directly, is the Liberal Catholic Church. Formed after Arnold Harris Mathew's condemnation of Theospohy in 1915, the Liberal Catholics were an admixture of Christian dogma with theosophic belief.[29] The primary leader of the new sect was one of

[23] Warren C. Platt, 'Polish National Catholic Church', *Church History* 46.4 (1977) 476.
[24] Abramtsov, 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy', *The Word* 6.4 (1969) 21.
[25] Ibid., 21.
[26] Ibid., 21.
[27] Ibid., 21.
[28] Ibid., 20. See also Simon Yonan, 'American Letter', *The Christian East* 4.2 (1923) 103.
[29] Space does not permit us time to completely describe Liberal Catholic beliefs, intriguing though they are. For a fuller description, see Warren C. Platt, 'The Liberal Catholic Church: An Analysis of a Hybrid Sect' (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1982), 51-165.

James Ingel Wedgwood, who was consecrated by Mathew's co-adjutor bishop.[30] Wedgwood himself had been an Anglo-Catholic earlier in life, though forced out of the Church of England for his Theosophist beliefs, and it is due to Wedgwood, along with Charles Leadbeater, that an ornate, though modified, version of the liturgy was retained.[31] Wedgwood was an active proselytiser, and Liberal Catholicism spread through most of the English-speaking world.[32] Two of the more important converts to the Liberal Catholic Church were Charles Louis Winnaert and Paul Tyler Turner, both of whom would be important leaders in Western Rite Orthodoxy in their own countries.

The Orthodox Church of France

Unlike Overbeck's vision to establish a full Western Rite Church quickly and by deliberate design, Western Rite Orthodoxy would come to France through happenstance. Louis-Charles Winnaert was born in 1898 into a Roman Catholic family in France and trained for the priesthood at the University of Lille and was ordained to the priesthood in 1905.[33] He served in a number of ecclesiastical appointments in the North of France and the Parisian suburbs before renouncing his Roman Catholic beliefs and taking his parish with him into the Liberal Catholic Church. He was ordained a bishop in 1922 by Wedgwood and began planning the Liberal Catholic Church in France.[34] Even so, Winnaert was never strongly connected to his fellow Liberal Catholics and by 1930 he had effectively removed himself from the communion. He changed the name of his organization to Evangelical Catholic Union which by this time included parishes in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Italy.[35]

Around the same time period, a group of Russians who had established a church in Parish had begun to petition the ruling hierarch, Metropolitan Eulogius, then under the Church of Russia, for permission to utilize a restored Gallican liturgy.[36] This liturgy was the product of a committee of the Confraternity of St Photios which was specifically

[30] Ibid., 27.
[31] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 344-5, 48 and Platt, 'The Liberal Catholic Church', 166-7.
[32] For a more detailed history of the Liberal Catholic Church, see Anson, *Bishops at Large*, Platt, 'The Liberal Catholic Church' 19 ff.
[33] Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishops*, 436.
[34] Ibid., 436.
[35] Ibid., 436.
[36] Abramtsov, 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy', *The Word* 6.4 (1969) 21.

devoted to the study of western liturgies.[37] Though some members of the commission requested permission to celebrate the restored rite, no official approval was provided. However, the experience was important for one member of the Commission, Eugraph Kovalevsky, whose devotion to the Gallican rite had been solidified by his studies while a member of the Confraternity. He would find a kindred spirit in Winnaert, and it was at Kovalevsky's urging that Winneart petitioned Metropolitan Eulogius to receive him and his followers into the Orthodox Church in 1930. However, Eulogius had separated from Moscow and was now under the authority of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which was not receptive towards Winnaert or his ideas for a Western Rite Church in France. Several years passed with Winnaert pleading for the Patriarch to make a decision, even to the point that Hieromonk Lev Gillet travelled to Istanbul in 1935 to plead personally for Winnaert, but to no avail.[38] Finally, Winnaert lost all hope for the Ecumenical Patriarch to support his vision and instead appealed to Moscow for support.

Aided by the other members of the Confraternity of St Photios, Winnaert sent his appeal to the *locum tenens* of the Moscow, Metropolitan Sergius on 18 March 1936. Sergius, as has already been seen, was familiar with Western liturgies, having served on the committee which made the original recommendations regarding the *BCP* to Bishop Tikhon of Alaska. The matter was made more urgent since Winnaert had fallen ill and it was expected that without his leadership the plan would ultimately fail. Sergius considered establishing a viable Western Rite Orthodoxy to be 'of profoundest significance',[39] and in Ukase 75, dated 16 June 1936, he established the procedure and conditions for Winnaert's reception. The path taken by Sergius was decidedly different from that taken by Philaret nearly seventy years earlier. While Philaret felt the need to seek the approval of other Orthodox prelates, Sergius felt it was within his competency to act of his own accord. This was because Winnaert differed from Overbeck in that the latter was attempting to establish a full Church while the former wanted to bring his already established parishes under legitimate ecclesiastical supervision. As such, Sergius considered this to be a matter for the Russian Church alone since the clergy of Winnaert's group would become clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church specifically and not of the

[37] Ibid., 21.
[38] Ibid., 22.
[39] Sergius, 'The Question of Western Orthodoxy' *One Church* 2.9-10 (1948) 27.

Orthodox Church generally.[40] Furthermore, while Overbeck had been denied reception as a priest because of his marriage, Sergius decided that Winnaert could be received as a priest provided he separated from his wife, citing Trullo Canon 3 as precedent. This was an important victory since it provided for pastoral continuity for Winnaert's followers, something which had been lacking with Overbeck and which, as has already been stated, contributed significantly to the failure of his petition.

The decision was communicated to Winnaert and on 2 December, he was received by the clergy of the Patriarchal Church in Paris.[41] The next several weeks were spent examining Winnaert's clergy and preparing them and their faithful for reception into the Orthodox Church. Winnaert dissolved his marriage, was tonsured a monk with the name Irénée, and was raised to the rank of archimandrite in February 1937. Finally, on 3 March, Winnaert succumbed to illness and died. Among the clergy who had been ordained for Winnaert's group was Eugraph Kovalevsky, who was selected to offer Winnaert's funeral mass.[42]

After Winnaert's death, Kovalevsky was named his successor as Dean of the Western Rite parishes. However, the outbreak of World War II quickly led to a significant disruption of parish life in France, both among the Western and Eastern Orthodox, as it did in other parts of Europe. Unlike the Polish and Czechoslovakian Western rite missions, the French Western rite would survive the war, though only one parish would remain open in Paris during the German occupation. During the war period, Kovalevsky began to work towards restoration of the ancient Gallican rite as the primary liturgy for the parishes under his care, collaborating with his brother Maxime Kovalevsky and Alexis van der Mensbrugghe. The latter relationship proved to be difficult and van der Mensburgghe disagreed sharply with the draft liturgy produced by Kovalevsky and eventually produced his own version, though his version was also poorly received.[43] Kovalevsky attempted to reproduce the rite as fully as possible, but was hampered by the lack of original sources and the rite was frequently accused of being a hodgepodge of

[40] Sergius, 'Ukase No. 75, 1936' §1-2 in 'Western Rite Ukase' *One Church* 7.4 (1954) 20.
[41] Abramtsov, 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy', *The Word* 6.4 (1969) 23.
[42] Ibid., 23.
[43] W. Jardine Grisbrooke, 'Obituary: Archbishop Alexis van der Mensbrugghe', *Sobornost* 4.2 (1980) 214-5. Questions regarding fidelity of the restored Gallican rites to the ancient authentic fragments of the rite have continued to follow the Kovalevsky and van der Mensburgghe reconstructions (see Woolfenden, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 164-76.

different liturgical traditions, though borrowing heavily from Byzantine sources to produce the rite currently in use.[44]

After the war, Kovalevsky returned to Paris and quickly began to reorganize the Western rite parishes under his supervision. Since the St Sergius Institute only taught courses in Russian and most of his current and potential clergy only knew French, Kovalevsky founded the *Institut de saint Denys* in 1944 with several noted theologians among the faculty, including Alexis van der Mensbrugghe (Patristics), Alexander Schmemann (Dogmatic Theology), and Louis Bouyer (Liturgics),[45] but controversy within the Russian émigré community caused several of the Russian faculty (including Schmemann) to withdraw after only a year of teaching. Among their most famous graduates was a Roman Catholic convert named Paul, who later switched to the Byzantine rite and made monastic profession. This early graduate is better known to North American as Archbishop Peter L'Huillier of New York and New Jersey.[46] Kovalevsky's own parish, celebrating the restored Gallican rite, also began to grow, and in a few years, it was necessary to move to a larger facility. The parish was able to purchase a building from the Old Catholics in France on Boulevard Auguste Blanqui where coincidentally enough Winnaert had celebrated Mass on several occasions before his conversion to Orthodoxy.[47] The first liturgy was held on 13 October 1946.

There was also an emerging monastic community in Paris with a Western rite. Lucien Chambault had entered Winnaert's church shortly before it was received into the Moscow Exarchate and was the priest of Ascension parish in Paris. Chambault was inspired by two Russian Archimandrites to make a monastic profession according to the Benedictine rule and Chambault began to translate and adapt the monastic offices described in the Rule of St Benedict, revising them to be as they were in 1054.[48] However, there was little that could be done during the war years as Chambault was left the only Western rite priest in Paris and was busy attending to the concerns of Ascension

---

[44] Woolfenden, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 164ff.
[45] Maxime Kovalevsky *Orthodoxie et occident*, 126. See also Grisbrooke, 'Obituary', *Sobornost* 4.2 (1980) 213. Kovalevsky claims this is the same Bouyer who would become one of the most important liturgical scholars of the century.
[46] Abramtsov, 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy', *The Word* 6.4 (1962) 25.
[47] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 127.
[48] Dennis Chambult, 'The Origins of the Orthodox Benedictine Community in Paris', *One Church* 9.11-12 (1955) 254.

parish. After the war, there was an opportunity for the movement to grow, and Chambault made monastic profession on 5 May 1944 along with John Peterfalvi. Taking the monastic name of Denis, he established the monastic house at Rue d'Allerary as the Priory of Sts Denis and Seraphim, attached to the parish church of Ascension. Chambault was well regarded and later received a reputation as a healer, mystic, and even an unofficial saint among some Western rite devotes.[49] At its height, the Priory and attached parish had as many as eight professed monks and over a hundred regular attendees, but by the time of Chambault's death in May 1963, the monks who had joined had either died or transferred to other locations. Left without a pastor, the parish shortly converted to the Byzantine rite and the Moscow Patriarchate's Western rite activity in France ended.[50]

However, there was conflict between Chambault and Kovalevsky, particularly over the matter of ritual. Kovalevsky, as has already been mentioned, attempted to restore the ancient Gallican rite, first celebrating his version in 1942. Chambault retained the Roman rite that Winneart had used, though to this he had added the Benedictine offices. To make matters worse, Chambault largely had the backing of Winnaert's Eastern rite supporters whereas Kovalevsky was increasingly isolated because of his liturgical ideas and initiatives.[51] Kovalevsky had also begun looking farther into the future for Western Rite Orthodoxy in France and proposed that the Western rite parishes should be administratively separate to preserve their liturgical independence, and at one point even sought to be made a bishop with jurisdiction over the Western rite parishes.[52] Though he approached the matter with a certain amount of naiveté, Kovalevsky was at least shrewd enough to realize that the tide had begun to turn against his vision of Western Rite Orthodoxy within the Moscow Exarchate. The difficulties he was experiencing reached a peak in 1953 when Kovalevsky was suspended from the priesthood for a period of a year and removed from the diocesan council.[53] Among other matters, he was accused of improper sacramental discipline by giving communion to non-Orthodox laity and

---

[49] Cf. 'Dom Denis Chambault, Pray for Us' *Western Orthodoxy Blog*, 3 May 2006 at <<http://westernorthodox.blogspot.com/2006/05/dom-denis-chambault-pray-for-us.html>>, retrieved 09 September 2009 and Barnabas Burton, *Strange Pilgrimage* (Welshpool: Stylite Publishing, 1985), 45-8.
[50] Alexis van Bunnen, 'Le Orthodox de rit occidental en Europe et aux États-Unis: Bilan et perspectives III', *Irenikon* 54.3 (1981) 338.
[51] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident*, 131-2.
[52] Ibid., 138.
[53] van Bunnen, 'Le Orthodox de rit occidental III', *Irenikon* 54.3 (1981) 339.

schismatic actions by establishing the Western rite parishes as a legal corporation in France with the name *Union des Associations Cultuelles Orthodoxes Françaises*.[54] However, the parishes under Kovalevsky's authority refused to recognize his suspension and withdrew from the authority of the Moscow Patriarchate. Kovalevsky was subsequently deposed and his followers excommunicated. Chambault's parish and priory remained with the Moscow Exarchate, but gained few successes and ultimately disbanded when Chambault died.

From 1953 until 1959, Kovalevsky's church was without regular canonical supervision. Initially, he had sought canonical protection from the Patriarch of Constantinople's Russian representative in Paris. While they were received into provisional supervision, things quickly soured when members of St Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute rendered a negative judgment on the authenticity of Kovalevsky's reconstructed Gallican rite.[55] Thereafter, the French churches were required by Constantinople to accept the Byzantine rite as a condition of their reception into the jurisdiction of Constantinople, which was widely considered unacceptable.[56] Thus, for a brief period of time, Kovalevsky's church, now known as the ECOF, wandered ecclesiastically adrift. By chance, one of Kovalevsky's associates was referred to Metropolitan Anastasius of the ROCA, where the Gallican rite would find its most powerful patron in Archbishop John Maximovitch.

John would only remain bishop of Western Europe until 1962 (though Western rite parishes remained under his personal jurisdiction), but his period of residence in Paris and his supervision of the French church would prove to be highly influential. He received Kovalevsky into the ROCA and under his direct supervision, making the Western rite parishes administratively separate from the Russian parishes in France.

---

[54] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 147-8. Kovalevsky rejected most of the charges against him as invalid or misunderstood. However, on the point of providing communion to non-Orthodox Christians, Kovalevsky justified his actions as necessary given the present realities of the ecclesial situation in France: 'je préférais greffer le plus rapidement possible les âmes assoiffées du Christ à la Vigne afin que la nourriture eucharistique les fortifie et les enracine profondément dans l'enseignement orthodoxe. Dois-je aussi rappeler que les chrétiens qui se dirigent vers nos paroisses occidentales sont pour la plupart d'origine romaine et qu'ils viennent chez nous parce qu'ils confessent dans l'essentiel la doctrine orthodoxe' (Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 156). Similar justifications were used to support the church's celebration of Easter according to the Gregorian calendar rather than the Julian calendar.

[55] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et Occident*, 172.

[56] Ibid., 170.

Archbishop John took a personal interest in Western liturgy, becoming the first and only Byzantine rite Orthodox hierarch to celebrate a pontifical Orthodox Western Rite liturgy in the modern era, celebrating the Gallican rite for the first time on 8 May 1960 to solemnize the reception of Kovalevsky's parishes.[57] The church's official name was also changed to *L'Église catholique orthodoxe de France* and they were required to correct what the ROCA synod viewed as specific irregularities, including the celebration of Easter on the Western date.[58] The Synod did agree to provide the Western rite parishes with their own bishop, who would serve as an auxiliary to Archbishop John, and on 11 November in 1964, Kovalevsky was ordained Bishop of St Denys with the episcopal name of Jean-Nectaire.[59]

In addressing the new bishop at his ordination, Archbishop John's words would prove to be prophetic, warning Kovalevsky that while his French followers would rejoice at his consecration, there were those who vehemently opposed Kovalevsky and his Western rite.[60] The response of other Orthodox churches in France was direct: Kovalevsky was not invited to join the *Conférence Interépiscopale Orthodoxe des Evêques de France* and their members were forbidden from communicating in the Western rite parishes.[61] Then in 1966, Archbishop John died suddenly, depriving the ECOF of its strongest support in the ROCOR synod. Matters were made worse by the fact that Kovalevsky had left Paris to make a pilgrimage to Israel, leading to a number of rumours about the future of the Church in the wake of Archbishop John's death.[62] Six of Kovalevsky's priests abandoned him for Archbishop Vitaly Ustinov, whom the ROCA synod had named as temporary superior to Kovalevsky. Furthermore, it became apparent that Synod was prepared to recognize the priests who had left Kovalevsky as the legitimate clergy of the French church and suspend Kovalevsky.[63] However, before the Synod could take action, Kovalevsky and his followers renounced the authority of Vitaly

[57] Ibid., 196.
[58] Ibid., 198ff.
[59] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 207.
[60] 'Le peuple français sera dans la joie, mais tu rencontreras des difficultés, car la haine est grande' (Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 208).
[61] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 210.
[62] Ibid., 213-14.
[63] Ibid., 214.

and Metropolitan Filaret in a letter dated 19 October 1966.[64] The ROCA Synod responded by deposing Kovalevsky and degrading him to a simple monk.[65]

Kovalevsky undertook this next sojourn thorough an independent existence in stride, attempting to present himself as the legitimate head of a local Orthodox Church. Through a pre-Lenten letter in 1967, sent to the head of each autocephalous Orthodox Church, Kovalevsky again broached the problem of the separate date for Easter, pleading for understanding on the part of other Churches.[66] The replies he received were cordial, though negative, with the exception of Patriarch Justinian of Romania who replied that the French Church should continue with their present practice so as to avoid disturbing the faithful.[67] Kovalevsky took this as an encouraging sign and made further contact with Justinian, seeking reception into Romanian jurisdiction.

Kovalevsky's sudden death on 30 January 1970 at the age of 64 did not slow negotiations with the Church of Romania, but rather increased the urgency of finding canonical protection. One of Kovalevksy's close associates, Giles Bertrand-Hardy, was selected to lead the French parishes while continuing to seek canonical protection from the Romanians. In April 1972, Justinian and the Romanian Synod agreed to accept the French Church after an investigation found them to be Orthodox in faith.[68] Subsequently, Hardy was selected to be the new bishop of the Church, receiving monastic tonsure on 29 April of the same year and, being given the monastic name Germain, and he was consecrated bishop on 11 June in his own cathedral.[69] Among the bishops who consecrated German was Theophil Ionesco who had assisted John Maximovitch in consecrating Kovalevsky six years earlier, and who had recently returned to the Romanian Patriarchate from the ROCA.[70]

Almost immediately, there was a protest from the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which was opposed to the reception of the French as *L'Église catholique orthodoxe de France* and the protocol's identification of the French as an autonomous Church, primarily

---

[64] Ibid., 223-4.
[65] ROCA Holy Synod, 'Decision of the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia in the Case of Eugraph John Kovalevsky', §4.1, *Orthodoxy* 12.2 (1969) 19.
[66] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 235-9
[67] Ibid., 237.
[68] Ibid., 237.
[69] Ibid., 238.
[70] Ibid., 237-8.

because of the jurisdictional implications that the patriarchal representative felt were made by both designations. In early 1974, the Romanian Synod reversed their earlier position on autonomy and changing the name of the Church to *Evêché Orthodoxe Catholique de France, sous la juridiction du Patriarcat roumain*. Germain was opposed to the name change since, in his opinion, it changed the canonical nature of the Church and called into question various aspects of its constitution, and so was cautious about using the new name.[71] Germain was also required to abandon parishes under his care in Italy, for reasons which were not subsequently explained.[72] However, none of these changes improved relations with the other Orthodox jurisdictions in France, and the ECOF was still excluded from *Conférence Interépiscopale Orthodoxe des Evêques de France* and its laity were not permitted to communicate in member parishes.[73]

So long as Justinian and Justin, Patriarch from 1977 to 1986, remained Patriarch, the position of the French Church remained secure.[74] There were still whispers of canonical irregularities, the most serious of which was that the French continued to communicate non-Orthodox laity at their masses. There were also accusations that the Church had not totally abandoned theosophy during the Winnaert years and that there were still theosophical elements remaining within the official theology of the group.[75] Though the accusations were made, not much was done against the Church after the 1974 protocol was issued; however, Germain was denounced to the Romanian Synod on at least one occasion.[76] Then, Patriarch Justin died and the time came to elect a successor, and the Teoctist Arăpaşu was chosen as successor. Following his enthronement, Teoctist confronted Germain with alleged canonical irregularities in the ECOF and demanded several concessions from the French Church to remain in communion. The most notable requirement was the use of the Byzantine rite as the primary Sunday liturgy, though the Gallican rite could be used only on a secondary basis.[77] The changes of terms were

---

[71] Ibid., 252.
[72] Ibid., 258-9.
[73] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 243-5.
[74] For a history of the Romanian Church during the Cold War, see Lucian N. Leustean, 'The Romanian Orthodox Church' in Lucian N. Leustean (ed.), *Eastern Christianity and the Cold War, 1945-91* (London: Routledge, 2010), 40-59.
[75] Basil Youdell, 'The Orthodox Church of France: A Brief Survey', *ENCL* 23.3 (1986)
[76] Kovalevsky, *Orthodoxie et occident*, 278-9.
[77] Bishop Germain (Bertrand-Hardy), 'Lettre du Conseil épiscopal de l'Eglise orthodoxe de France'. <<http://orthodoxie.free.fr/entretiens_bucarest%20-%201986.htm>>.

clearly not acceptable to the clergy of the French church. Germain was ultimately accused of disobedience by the Synod and deposed from the episcopate. Those few parishes who wished to remain under Romanian jurisdiction were required to accept Teoctist's demands and were placed under the care of Gregoire Bertrand-Hardy, Bishop Germain's brother. The majority of the Church followed Germain into schism in 1994, though this time no canonical shelter was easily found.

Antiochian Western Rite Vicariate

The first real attempt to create a canonical and lasting Western Rite presence within the Orthodox Church was the accidental result of early abortive efforts to establish an autocephalous church in North America. Following the October Revolution and the subsequent chaotic ecclesiastical environment,[78] there were attempts to establish a unified North American Church, independent of Moscow, intended to be led by Bishop Aftimios Ofiesh. Aftimios had been sent to the United States in December, 1905, to assist Raphael Hawaweeny in administering the Syrian churches in North America.[79] Upon Raphael's death in 1915, Aftimios was chosen to succeed Raphael and in 1917 was consecrated by Metropolitan Platon Rozhdestvensky as Bishop of Brooklyn. In 1927, having already been elevated to the rank of archbishop by Platon in 1923, Aftimios was charged with building a native Church in North America.[80] As the head of the local Orthodox Church,

[78] The chaos resulting from the October Revolution and the subsequent persecution of the Russian Church is well documented in other places. The ultimate result was the creation of multiple Russian-derived churches in North America (the Metropolia, the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, and the so-called 'Living Church'), none having any direct contact with legitimate Patriarch or his *locum tenens*. Additionally, the American church suffered from financial crisis, leadership disputes between representatives of the Metropolia and Russian Orthodox Church Abroad and the so-called 'Living Church', and the defection of multiple ethnic constituencies from Russian hegemony. This last issue resulted in numerous separate, ethnic Orthodox organizations in North America owing loyalty to national churches in Europe and the Middle East rather than the Russian bishops, resulting in the multiple overlapping jurisdictions present today. For further details on the results of the post-1917 ecclesiastical situation in North America, see Tarasar, *Orthodox America*, 173 ff.

[79] Tarasar, *Orthodox America*, 192.

[80] The circumstances surrounding this first attempt at creating a pan-Orthodox autocephalous church in North America are unclear, and questions remain as to what relationship Aftimios was to have with both the Church of Russia, which had sponsored Aftimios to this point, or with Metropolitan Platon, who at this time was suffering from his own problems with the Russian Church. The account is considered primarily in Archimandrite Seraphim, *The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity* (New York: Saints Boris and Gleb Press, 1973), though a summation is available in Tarasar, *Orthodox America*. It is little concern for the present as to why such a venture was undertaken or why Aftimios was specifically chosen for the project, suffice to

Archbishop Aftimios set about the task of creating a governing Synod, consecrating Emmanuel Abo-Hatab as bishop of Montreal in 1927 and Sophronius Bishara as bishop of Los Angeles the next year. The state of the new church seemed relatively stable, but opposition to the new Church was swift and far reaching. The Karlovist Synod was opposed to the move, primarily because it had already severed relations with Platon two years prior and consequently viewed all of his actions as void in any case.[81] Archbishop Alexander Rodostolou, who had been appointed by Patriarch Meletios of Constantinople, opposed Aftimios since he viewed the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch as the natural locus of authority in America.[82] Even Platon, who had initially sponsored Aftimios' new Church, quickly began to back away, especially as backers in the Episcopal Church felt threatened by a church body in what they felt was their jurisdiction targeting their flocks and accordingly threatened to withhold the financial subsidies Platon desperately needed.[83] To make matters worse, Bishop Emmanuel abandoned Aftimios for Metropolitan Platon in 1929.

Increasingly without support, Aftimios sought to rebuild his synod and in 1932 consecrated two more bishops: Joseph Zuk as Aftimios' assistant and William Albert Nichols as Bishop of Washington. Joseph was an important choice since he possessed the loyalty of several Ukrainian parishes and thus would theoretically help stem the tide of parishes abandoning the new American Church for the Metropolia, the Greek Archdiocese, or one of the two Antiochian missions. More relevant for the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy was the second choice in William Nichols, better known by his ecclesiastical name Ignatius. Things quickly began to unravel for the new Church. Without warning, Archbishop Aftimios married Miriam Namey in a civil ceremony in 1933.[84] As Aftimios' marriage was forbidden under canon law, an immediate crisis emerged in the Church over what was to be done. When Aftimios' marriage was acknowledged, Nichols and Joseph met as a synod and determined that Aftimios had

---

say that the project, along with the assumption that this Church was to be a primarily American institution, is what motivated Aftimios to have any connection with the Western rite in the first place.

[81] Serafim, *The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity*, 37.

[82] Ibid., 37.

[83] Ibid., 38-9.

[84] Tarasar, *Orthodox America*, 194.

resigned, thus clearing the path for succession.[85] For his part, Nichols continued as a bishop in the AOCC, but his personal situation is rather confused, making subsequent events difficult to determine. According to Peter Anson, Ignatius was already married by the time he had been ordained bishop in 1932, with the implication that Ignatius' own marriage prompted Aftimios to marry as well.[86] Others place Nichols' marriage in June 1933, shortly after Joseph's election.[87] Regardless, Joseph's leadership of the new Church was short-lived as he died February of 1934.[88] For his part, Sophronios acted of his own initiative to depose Aftimios and suspend Nichols in 1933; he attempted to run the Church as its sole bishop, though he died shortly after making himself head of the Church.[89] In one swift stroke, nearly the entire hierarchy of the AOCC was eliminated, leaving Nichols as the sole survivor of Aftimios' vision of an ethnically united autocephalous Orthodox Church.[90] A more unworthy individual likely could not have been found.

Nichols was born December 4, 1867 and had a particularly varied career. He was trained as a journalist, and worked as religion editor for both the *New York Sun* and the *New York Telegram*. He had been a ordained a priest in the Episcopal Church in 1910, but left over a decade later to receive episcopal consecration from Samuel Gregory Lines in 1922 and consecrated *sub conditione* by Arthur Edward Leighton in 1929.[91] It is not clear when Nichols converted to Orthodoxy. We do know that Nichols received episcopal consecration from Aftimios in September, 1932, so it is possible that Nichols converted

---

[85] What precisely happened is a matter of interpretation. Tarasar states that Aftimios 'abandoned his episcopal rank,' (Tarasar, *Orthodox America*, 194), while Miriam N. Ofiesh, *Archbishop Aftimios Ofiesh* (Sun City West: Aftimios Abihider, 1999), 221, indicates that Aftimios always intended to serve as a married bishop. Ward (*Independant Bishops,* 302) declares that Aftimios was deposed, but the documents cited by Serafim (*The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity*, 41) do not lend themselves to such an interpretation; if he was deposed, it was only by the actions of Sophronios, as Joesph and Nichols seemingly took no action against their hierarchical superior, though they lent him no practical aid, either.

[86] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 503 and Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishops*, 302.

[87] Ibid., 296.

[88] Ibid., 447.

[89] Serafim, *The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity*, 42.

[90] However, it should be noted that before he died Sophronios consecrated Christopher Kontogiorgios (more commonly Contogeorge) and John More-Moreno to the episcopate. Kontogiorgios is later identified as Exarch of the Patriarch of Alexandria in 1947, while More-Moreno went on into the Independent Catholic Movement, though eventually founding the Orthodox Catholic Church in America. The episcopal successors of both individuals would later have connections with independent Western Rite groups. See the individual entries in Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishops* for further information.

[91] Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishops*, 295-6.

to Orthodoxy as early as 1930. Aftimios intended Nichols to serve as an English-speaking missionary bishop within the AOCC.[92] The impending troubles which faced the Church were foreshadowed in Nichols' consecration was the last service held in St Nicholas Cathedral before Aftimios and his followers were evicted.[93] Anecdotally, Nichols was an amicable if not entirely consistent individual. One reminiscence from 1934 recalled Nichols as

> …a sporty old dog. He wore his clericals in the newspaper office in New York, and when we got to the ferry boat to go to his home on Staten Island, I followed him down the length of the dock, while he greeted everyone he know cordially with a word and the sign of the cross in blessing. Picturesque is no word for him. He had a dollar up on the horses every afternoon, and in a very warm and human way was very much of the bohemian world of newspaperdom.[94]

With Joseph and Sophronios deceased and Aftimios essentially retired while awaiting an ecumenical council to hear his claims,[95] Nichols was left as the sole bishop to head the AOCC.

True to his roots and consistent with the confused canonical situation that had befallen the Church, Nichols began leading his Church closer to the various Independent Catholic groups that had grown in the United States in the previous several decades. On 8 May 1934 Nichols re-consecrated George Winslow Plummer of the Anglican Universal Church. Plummer took the episcopal name Mar Georgius and immediately re-consecrated three of his bishops with the assistance of Nichols.[96] The two would go on to form the Holy Orthodox Church in America (Eastern Catholic and Apostolic), with Nichols serving as Plummer's bishop coadjutor while simultaneously remaining head of the AOCC. By 1939, he was no longer associated with Plummer.[97] His consecration of Plummer was not the only dubious elevation to the episcopate that Nichols made, as several other men of questionable motives were provided with 'legitimate' apostolic

---

[92] Serafim, *The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity*, 40.
[93] Ofiesh, *Archbishop Aftimios Ofiesh*, 175.
[94] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 504.
[95] Ofiesh, *Archbishop Aftimios Ofiesh*, 221.
[96] Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishop*, 323.
[97] Cf. Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, *Yearbook of American Churches* (New York: Round Table Press, 1935-39).

succession, including Frank Dyer.[98] In fact, Nichols would continue on consecrating priests and bishops 'with a zest for life and filled with boundless energy',[99] though he would never join any of the bodies created by his spiritual children. For that matter, after 1940 he would have increasingly fewer responsibilities within the Church which he technically led. Nichols finally died in 1947, having been the pastor of a Congregationalist Church in Pennsylvania for most of the decade.

Prior to the great upheavals that would ruin Aftimios' unified American Church, Nichols founded a society for Christians interested in celebrating the Western liturgy within the Orthodox Church. The society was originally intended as a fellowship of priests and lay brothers who celebrated the Western liturgy; they were named the Society of Clerks Secular of Saint Basil, often abbreviated to Society of St Basil, the Basilian Fathers, or SSB. The society was never particularly large, but it did include an individual of particular enthusiasm for the Western rite: Paul Tyler Turner, better known by his religious name of Alexander. Turner had was a Liberal Catholic priest for a number of years, but slowly became discouraged by the theosophic doctrine of the movement and began to seek another ecclesiastical cover. He had heard of the reception of another former Liberal Catholic Church in France which was allowed to retain the Western liturgy, and he sought out Nichols and the Society of St Basil. By this time, Turner, with his wife's assistance, had opened a small chapel dedicated to the Holy Wisdom in New York City which offered the Roman liturgy in English, though they would move to a small location in Mount Vernon in 1946. Turner and his mission were accepted by Nichols into the American Orthodox Church in the early part of the 1930's and Turner was simultaneously inducted into the Society of St Basil. Despite being a priest, Turner and his wife both maintained regular employment, with Alexander working as a sound technician for CBS.

Turner's precise relationship with the floundering American Orthodox Church is unclear. Certainly, he supported the decision to have married bishops at some point,[100] but there is little evidence he was concerned with Ofiesh or Nichols in any great way.

---

[98] Dyer consecrated Robert Anderson Jardine, who is probably most famous for having performed the wedding of the abdicated Edward VIII to Wallis Simpson.
[99] Anson, *Bishops at Large*, 505.
[100] A. Turner, 'An Orthodox Primer', 17.

There is one brief remark in Ofiesh's biography stating that Turner approached the former archbishop seeking validation of his episcopal consecration,[101] but this seems unlikely as Turner himself never provided episcopal consecration to anyone else, despite the fact that Nichols is a primary source of independent episcopal lineage in the United States. Nichols did not consecrate Turner as a bishop until November, 1936, after the American Orthodox Church was officially incorporated by the New York State legislature as a religious body; at the same time he was made a bishop, Turner received more responsibility for the management of the Basilians. He took his work with the Society of St Basil seriously and in 1940 began a quarterly periodical entitled *The Basilian* which ran in a series of ten issues to a volume. Articles in *The Basilian* were of a reasonable quality, with an intermixing of photographs, scholarly articles reprinted from other sources, and writings of Turner or other Basilians on theology or liturgy. Upon Nichols death in 1947, Turner became the superior of both the Basilians and the senior bishop of the AOCC. He would attempt to keep his Church on stable footing, even to the point of establishing a seminary in 1952, though there is little evidence that much headway was ever made on a curriculum.[102]

Though Nichols had been active right up to the time of his death, the fortunes of the Basilians had waned, and the AOCC continued to show declines during the period of Nichols' leadership of the church. Turner himself was convinced that there was no future for the Society of St Basil with an ambiguous canonical status and, moreover, that this lack of regularity deprived the wider Orthodox Church of its rightful Western expression; consequently, Turner sought means to regularize his relationship to the Antiochian

[101] Ofiesh, *Archbishop Aftimios Ofiesh*, 222. Along with Turner, Ofiesh mentions James Toombs, Joseph Klimowicz and Peter Zurewetski, though only Toombs and Turner were consecrated by Nichols or one of his ecclesiastical offspring. For her part, the author claims that there were many other came seeking Aftimios' approval whom she could not remember, so possible that she has remembered Turner's presence incorrectly. There is also several problems related to the biography itself, primarily that it has been used to justify Aftimios' actions and portray him as a saint persecuted by the Church. Miriam Ofiesh also served on the board of directors for The Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America, which does not recognize any other Orthodox Church in North America as legitimate. They regard Ofiesh as the legitimate ecclesiastical authority in North America and hold that the see has been held in *locum tenens* by Mary Ofiesh since Aftimios' death in 1966. Thus, with Turner as the former leader of the Society of St Basil and his subsequent association with an 'illegitimate' authority, it is quite possible Ofiesh has recorded the incident in question to cast dispersion on Turner and consequently on the Antiochian Western rite, though given the brevity of the comment it is difficult to ascertain nefarious intent for certain. For more on The Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America, see n. 116 below.

[102] Cf. Schnerlia, 'Report of the Western Rite Vicar General', *The Word* 14.8 (1970) 18-19.

church almost as soon as he became the leader of his Church.[103] Several important individuals were already aware of the Basilians and their Western rite mission, but perhaps the most significant acquaintance Turner made during the years was Paul Schneirla. Schneirla had met Turner during the 1930's when the latter was still pastor of St Clement's Chapel in Rochester. Aside from his contact with Turner, Schnerlia had significant experience with the Western rite, having lived in Paris and taught at the St Sergius Academy. Schnerlia, on behalf of Turner, approached Metropolitan Anthony Bashir asking him to accept the few parishes under Turner's supervision into the Antiochian Archdiocese. Anthony was willing to request that the Antiochian Holy Synod take up the matter, but he was not particularly optimistic that such a project would be accepted, especially if the parishes continued using the Western liturgy. But the reception to Anthony's inquiry was more favourable that might have otherwise been anticipated, and Patriarch Alexander subsequently gave approval to Anthony's plans to receive the remaining Basilians on 31 May 1958.[104]

Anthony took Alexander's permission to use his pastoral discretion seriously, and promptly issued an edict outlining the basic shape the Western rite mission would take later that same year.[105] Among other requirements, Anthony mandated all converts were to accept the Orthodox faith, must be received into or with an established parish and remain within their own rite unless granted a dispensation, and that Western rite faithful must be subject to the ecclesiastical law of the Church of Antioch.[106] Even before the Western Rite Edict was published, Turner began preparing for reception by Anthony. In 1952, he had re-titled *The Basilian* and beginning with volume six the quarterly became known as *Orthodoxy*. The journal took a new editorial direction and while it still focused on Orthodox subjects, the content was redesigned to educate the readership on the beliefs of the Orthodox Church and to situate Orthodoxy within the wider Christian spectrum. The parishes of the AOCC were quietly placed under probationary supervision for the

[103] A. Turner, 'Western Orthodoxy: A New Era', *Orthodoxy* 9.1 (1961) 5.
[104] Patriarch Alexander's reply included not only his approval for a project, but also information concerning the circumstances of Overbeck's petition in the nineteenth century, the 1904 *RO* and Metropolitan Sergius' Ukaz permitting Winnaert's reception as tool to help Metropolitan Anthony apply the Patriarchal permission more effectively. Anthony made use of all these elements in preparing for Turner's reception into the Archdiocese.
[105] Metropolitan Anthony (Bashir), 'Edict on the Western Rite', reprinted in *The Word* 2.8 (1958) 3.
[106] Ibid., §7.

next several years. Finally, at Easter in 1961, everything was prepared. The three remaining parishes under Turner's supervision, and all the remaining Basilians, by this time only nine professed members, were received into the Antiochian Archdiocese during Holy Week. The clergy were ordained as priests and Turner himself was given the rank of mitred archpriest and named the first Vicar General of the Antiochian Western Rite Vicariate.

In originally explaining the Western Rite Edict in 1958, Anthony had stated that no one should expect either immediate or significant gains for the Western rite.[107] However, growth did take place slowly with the conversion of Edwin West from The Episcopal Church in 1963 in protest over the theology and lifestyle of James Pike, Bishop of California.[108] West brought his parish (Church of the Redeemer) in Palo Alto, California, with him when he converted. In 1967, Maurice Francis Parkin would be received with three of his clergy and the parish of St Anne in Mount Holly, New Jersey into the Western Rite.[109] In addition to being a bishop of the North American Old Catholic Church, Parkin was also superior of a small monastic community known as St Luke's Priory in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The small community had originally been founded in 1937 as an Anglo-Catholic house dedicated to work with indigent men under the leadership of Parkin, who also served as Prior. The priory did not remain in the Episcopal Church for very long, and by 1940 was under the supervision of Richard Arthur Marchenna, who would ordain Parkin as a bishop in 1950.[110] After St Luke's reception into the AWRV, the monks would provide all of the publications for the AWRV. At their height, the community published a magazine entitled *Credo* for the Vicariate and counted two dozen professed members and oblates. After Parkin's death in 1974, the remaining professed members would sell the house and live largely separate lives waiting to find a new monastic home. Eventually during the late 1980's the community was disbanded and publication of *Credo* ceased, though the Vicariate continued to use the Press to produce official Western rite publications and eventually relocated the press to Spokane, Washington.

---

[107] Metropolitan Anthony (Bashir), 'Thirteenth Annual Convention: The Western Rite', *The Word* 2.11 (1958) 16.
[108] Alexander Turner, 'Edwin Elliot West', *Orthodoxy* 10.6 (1965) 165.
[109] Schnerlia, 'Minutes of the Annual Convention – Report on the Western Rite' *The Word* 16.9 (1972) 16.
[110] Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishops*, 312.

In 1968, Turner's health began to fail as he suffered from a series of strokes. His responsibilities were divided among different persons both within and outside the Vicariate. Paul Schnerlia was named as administrator of the Vicariate in 1968, assuming most of the responsibilities that had occupied Turner outside of his parish work. The same year, he relinquished responsibilities for the publication of *Orthodoxy* to Joseph Salkeld and William Ischie, both of the newly established Western rite missions of the ROCA. The character of the journal changed from what Turner had originally developed, leaving behind the reissuance of scholarly articles of importance to Orthodox history and focusing more on popular items. The issuance was also changed from a quarterly journal to a bi-monthly magazine, and the quality of the writing, in general, declined with the change. Finally, after a long period of illness, Alexander Turner died on 1 November 1971 at the age of 66.

Though not directly related to the AWRV, there is perhaps no better place to discuss the rather short history of the Western Rite within the ROCA. The ROCA Western Rite officially began on 27 March 1962 with the reception by Bishop Dositheus of the three monks of the Mount Royal Monastery in Woodstock, New York, led by their superior Augustine Whitfield. The monks received a chapel in the ROCA cathedral in New York City, but did not attract many followers. Their influence would be carried on later with the reception of Christ the Saviour monastery several decades later. The ROCA Western Rite gained its first parishes on 22 August 1968 with the reception of St Anthony Church by the ROCA Synod as a Western rite parish. The events surrounding the reception of this parish remain unclear, even down to the form of rite they used. Nothing is ever stated regarding their previous affiliations or the negotiations that preceded their reception into the ROCA. Like the AWRV counterpart, the ROCA Western rite remained small, never growing to more than three parishes.[111] Almost immediately after their admission to the ROCA, the priest of St Gregory, Michael Smith, was placed under suspension for reasons that were never stated.[112] *Orthodoxy* would only continue to the second issue of 1970 before publication ceased. Eventually, two

[111] The parishes which comprised the ROCA Western rite were St Anthony, Old Greenwich, Connecticut; Holy Resurrection, Atlanta, Georgia; and St Gregory, College Station, Pennsylvania.
[112] Joseph Salkeld, 'Decisions of the Synod of Bishops Pertaining to the Western Rite', *Orthodoxy* 12.4 (1969) 5.

parishes left the ROCA for the AWRV, before simply fading into obscurity,[113] while Holy Trinity in Atlanta continued along without any significant growth. There were no other attempts to establish additional Western rite parishes in the ROCA synod denounced the Western Rite in 1979;[114] Holy Trinity Church ceased to exist after the death of its pastor in 1980.

After Turner's death, Francis Forbes, the last fully professed member of the Basilians, eventually decided that the Antiochian Archdiocese was incapable of preserving a dedicated Western rite mission and that the Society of St. Basil would be better served independent of the Antiochians.[115] To that end, Forbes abandoned the Antiochian Archdiocese to reconstitute the Basilian order, but the situation was initially perilous as Forbes had only been ordained as a priest. Forbes received episcopal consecration from Colin James Guthrie on July 4, 1974 and re-consecration from Thomas Jude Baumler later the same year, thus securing a limited future of his church.[116] Forbes, who had become the *de facto* leader of the Basilians, divested the order of the New York motherhouse and moved to Nashville, Tennessee, changing the name of his Church from the American Orthodox Church to the Holy Orthodox Church – American Jurisdiction. Over the next several years, Forbes would consecrate several additional bishops for his

[113] Cf. Metropolitan Roman, *A Directory of Western Rite Parishes* (Akron: Eastern Christian Press, 1986), 16, 21, 38. Roman does not state that Holy Resurrection in Atlanta moved to the AWRV and is unsure of what happened to the parish in any case.

[114] The actual resolution of the ROCA Synod of Bishops states that 'The Western Rite in its present form was introduced after the apostasy of the West from the Orthodox Church and is not in accord with the liturgical life of the Orthodox Church with which it had been united for the course of many centuries. It does not reflect the Orthodox Church's liturgical tradition. Thus, it does not satisfy converts to Orthodox when they familiarize themselves with it to a greater degree, and has nowhere enjoyed success. In consequence of the above, the Council of Bishops does not recognize it as possible to permit the Western Rite in the Russian Church' ('Resolutions of the Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, 1978', ROCOR Synod of Bishops, *Newsletter #21*, 5, January - February 1979, <<http://www.allmercifulsavior.com/Liturgy/No-Wr-by-ROCOR.pdf>>) The intent to repudiating the Western rite seems clear enough from the text, though private conversations with individuals advocates for the Western rite in ROCOR claim that the intent was not to eliminate the use of Western rites *per se*, but to suppressing the use of Tridentine or Anglican versions of those rites. Others state that the English version is a malicious translation of the official Russian text perpetuated by Holy Trinity Monastery at a time when it served as the official English-language arm of ROCA during this period. There may be some truth to this claim as Mount Royal continued to function even after the declaration, though this may have more to do with support for Abbot Augustine specifically than anything else. Either way, the declaration would have a stifling affect on possibilities for the Western rite in ROCOR for a number of years, only turning around within the last decade.

[115] Ward, et. al., *Independent Bishops*, 144

[116] Ibid., 144. Both of these consecrations connected Forbes back to Nichols abstractly, since Guthrie had been consecrated by Robert Schuyler Zeiger who had in turn received consecration from George Winslow Plummer. Baumler had also been consecrated by Guthrie shortly before his consecration of Forbes.

Church, though several ultimately abandoned the Forbes church to form their own independent bodies. Nevertheless, the church endured the next several decades and still exists in the present time, though it seems to consist of only a small handful of parishes in the southeastern United States. When Forbes died in December 2008, it had been nearly twenty-five years since he had actively headed the church he founded. Other groups outside Orthodoxy have continued to lay claim to the legitimate succession from Aftimios and the Society of St Basil, most notably The Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America, which maintains a firm internet presence but seems to have no real external identity.[117]

Still, the loss of one individual would not prove to be the undoing of the entire movement, and the AWRV continued. New avenues for growth opened in 1976 with the reception of Incarnation in Detroit, Michigan. Incarnation was a parish of the Episcopal Church before its reception by the Antiochian Archdiocese in 1976, a victim of the recent turmoil that had overtaken the American branch of the Anglican Communion. Just two years earlier in 1974, eleven women were ordained as priests illicitly in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania by three bishops without current diocesan charges or authorization, and four more women were ordained the following year, though it was not until the General Convention in 1976 that women were lawfully ordained priests in the Episcopal Church. During this period, several experimental changes to the 1928 American *BCP*, known as *Services for Trial Use*, were circulated within the Church, culminating in a new *BCP* issued following the General Convention in 1979.

Though there were a number of parishes within the Episcopal Church which left the main body, most formed independent Anglican groups and some entered one of the Orthodox jurisdictions in North America. Incarnation was one of only a few former Episcopal churches that joined the AWRV, but the impact it had stretched far beyond what might be expected. Joseph Angwin, the parish priest, described as an 'extreme ritualist', was motivated to petition for the use of the prayerbook, as revised by his parish,

[117] THEOCACNA is a rather interesting entity, which claims that all lineal claims through Nichols are illegitimate, so it is unclear how precisely the body traces its lineage back to Aftimios since Sophronios did not consecrate any additional bishops and those bishops who were consecrated by Zuk were part of the Independent Catholic Movement and ultimately associated with other bodes besides the American Orthodox Church. THEOCACNA's existence seems primarily limited to a free host website where they make their claims and threaten litigation against any person or entity claiming to be the Society of St Basil or even linking to their website without permission!

as the liturgical rite instead of the Gregorian rite which had been used by all Western rite parishes to this point. Metropolitan Philip gave tentative approval to the new liturgy, and work began revising the liturgy according to the standards prescribed by the *RO*. This liturgy, initially entitled 'The Divine Liturgy: Western Rite,' is what ultimately became TIK. The same period also saw growing ecumenical dialogue between the PNCC in the United States and the Antiochian Archdiocese. Especially within the AWRV, the PNCC was seen as a potential means of growth for the AWRV since it was assumed that that formerly PNCC parishes would continue using the Western liturgy. Even as late as 1994 there were hopes for a possible union between the PNCC and the Antiochian Archdiocese, but no union ever materialized.

Despite the reception of Incarnation in Detroit and its possibilities for missionary outreach, the future for AWRV at the 1978 Archdiocesan Convention was not positive. There were more parishes in 1978 than there had been ten years earlier when Schneirla assumed effective responsibility for the Vicariate; the AWRV had more than doubled in size from four parishes to eight. However, of those eight, only two (St Luke and St Anne) were already in the AWRV at the start of the decade, and none of the parishes were among the original founders of the Vicariate nearly twenty years ago. Most of the parishes owned their own facility, but this was hardly an indicator of stability or future growth, and by the end of the decade, most would cease to exist entirely. Only Incarnation and St Stephen's, both newly founded, would endure through the decade. The next decade would bring new, stable parishes that would endure to the present. In 1980, St Andrew's Church in Eustis, Florida was received into the AWRV, along with several other parishes from the Episcopal Church. Saint Andrew's priest, Fr. Michael Keiser, began developing a parish prayer book to codify the liturgical materials provided by the Vicariate. Several years later, a paperback version of what would become the *SASB* was printed by the parish and was quickly picked up by a number of other churches. The appearance of a full liturgical service book would help to stabilize the liturgical life of the movement, and eventually the AWRV would reissue several liturgical books in the years leading up to the publication of *TOM* in 1995. Western Rite Orthodoxy in the Antiochian Archdiocese of North America had established itself on secure if not always stable footing.

The Current Status of Western Rite Orthodoxy

The AWRV has continued to grow during the first decade of the twenty-first century, though as during previous periods of growth, the majority of newcomers have been disaffected Anglicans coming from one or more of the various splinter groups rather than from The Episcopal Church. While the use of revised liturgies is often provided as motivation for their departure, trends indicate that most AWRV parishes have become Orthodox for non-liturgical reasons. The majority of recent conversions have come from former members of the CEC, a group unrelated to the Anglican Communion but borrowing many important Anglican features, including the 1979 American *BCP* and episcopal organization. However, what prompted these conversions was not dissatisfaction with the liturgical rite since the 1928 American *BCP* was an accepted, though minority, use in the CEC. These new Western rite parishes were part of a schism within the CEC resulting from allegations against the senior episcopate of that body during 2006 and 2007, though the details on precisely what took place are not clear at present. Thus, the attractive point of Western Rite Orthodoxy was the regularization of ecclesiastical life within an historic church and not simply the undistributed use of an older liturgy. It remains to be seen whether the promotion of Western Rite Orthodoxy as an alternative to liturgical evolution in the Roman Catholic, Anglican and Lutheran Churches will appeal to potential converts from the CEC or if the liturgical message will evolve into one featuring the importance of the Orthodox dogmatic tradition.

The number of parishes continues to fluctuate, with new missions being founded and disappearing quickly from the scene and some well established parishes closing or switching to the Byzantine rite. The most recent change of rite was Christ the Savior in Anderson, South Carolina in 2001. Nevertheless, that the oldest of the Western Rite parishes, St Michael's in Whittier, California has experienced a successful transition in leadership after the death of Archimandrite Michael Trigg in 2007; in the subsequent years, there was no move to change rites. That St Andrew's in Florida has also changed leadership on a few occasions without movement towards the Byzantine rite is a positive sign for the AWRV. With the thirty-fifth anniversary of St Michael's reception in 2010,

the parish will be the longest continuingly functioning Western rite parish in history. While these two successes cannot speak for the entirety of the movement, the present growth spurts coupled with the longevity of several parishes at least speak well for future possibilities if the Western rite is left to grow on its own without external pressure towards Byzantinisation.

The present status of the ECOF is certainly less positive. In 2001, it was revealed that Bishop Germain had married following his deposition by the Romanian Synod in 1993, which caused a schism in the Church of France. Though the majority remained with Germain, several parishes throughout France seceded from Germain's oversight to form *Union des Associations Cultuelles Orthodoxes de Rite Occidental*, and began seeking ways to restore ties with canonical Orthodoxy. A delegation from the *Union* was received in Belgrade by Patriarch Pavle in September, 2004 and a special commission of the Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church was established to determine the best course for the parishes.[118] The following year, it was decided that the clergy and faithful could be received under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church, but only as individual parishes and not as a cohesive unit. Furthermore, each parish was required to 'accept the divine liturgy and sacraments of the Orthodox Church',[119] meaning abandonment of the Gallican rite. The *Union* assented to the conditions the following January. Like those parishes that remained with the Church of Romania, the Byzantine rite is the dominate rite of parishes within the Serbian Church, with the Liturgy of St Germain used on special occasions. As for the ECOF, it has remained active and currently counts twenty-eight parishes or missions, and Germain remains the sole bishop of the Church. They continue to dispute the canonical legitimacy of Germain's deposition without ecclesiastical trial in 1993.[120]

Standing in stark contrast to the confused situation in France is the reversal of fortunes experienced by the Western Rite under the ROCOR. What looked to be a dying

---

[118] Information Service of the Serbian Orthodox Church, 'Communiqué of the Special Commission for Examining the Request of UACORO of the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church' 14 December 2004. <<http://www.spc.rs/Vesti-2004/12/14-12-04-e.html>>

[119] Holy Synod of Bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church, 'Protocole de reception dans las communion de l'Eglise orthodoxe Serbe et de toutes les eglises orthodoxes du groupe appele Jusqu'a present UACORO', No. 893 §598, 15 June 2005. <<http://orthodoxe.free.fr/files/Protocole_UACORO.pdf>>

[120] Église orthodoxe de France, '*Lieux de culte en France*', 3 September 2009. <<http://orthodoxie.free.fr/lieux_de_culte.htm>>

entity at the start of the twenty-first century has proven to be of remarkable resilience. In 2006, the St Benedict Church in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma was authorized to use the Western liturgy in addition to the Byzantine rite. Though the parish only celebrates the Western rite on Saturdays, it does stand as one of the few non-monastic foundations or dependants within ROCOR. Christminster Monastery would again move in 2008, this time to larger facilities in Hamilton, Ontario in the hope that they could accept new monastic vocations in the future. The monks serve Our Lady of Glastonbury, which is co-located on the monastery grounds. In its place in Rhode Island, a small mission dedicated to St Cuthbert was established, but it does not seem to have grown significantly since establishment. The same period of time also saw the establishment of two 'study societies' dedicated to assisting people who wish to convert Orthodoxy in either rite, but both groups have specifically promote the Western rite in their particular locations. Finally, the reception of two former Milan Synod monks into ROCOR as hieromonks has substantively increased ROCOR's Western rite population. One of the monks, Fr. Aiden Keller, is known among Western Rite Orthodox for his promotion of a Sarum-style liturgy via the internet. With the addition of Keller, ROCOR now officially has four versions of the Western rite in use: the English Liturgy, GRE, Sarum (Keller), and St John the Divine, the latter being a recreation of the Stowe Missal.

Conclusion

Western Rite Orthodoxy in the twentieth century has found itself tightly bound with what is now known as the Independent Sacramental Movement. This is clearly demonstrated in the fact that many of the important Western rite leaders in the century were *episcopi vagantes* for at least part of their non-Orthodox ecclesiastical lives or eventually became regarded as *vagantes*, as we see in the case of Villete and Matthew. What is not readily apparent is why some among these *vagantes* succeeded in building a successful Orthodox Western Rite (Turner) while others have experienced constant setback even though they may have come from within the Orthodox Church (such as Kovalevsky). Part of the issue may be the way in which the various parties approached the question of Orthodoxy. In Vilatte and Matthew's cases, the main concern with episcopal ordination and consequently legitimating their episcopal state via some external

authority, regardless of who that was. Both individuals were willing to remain 'Orthodox' so long as it served their purpose though were willing to disregard Orthodoxy when it was no longer expedient for their purposes. This same desire for 'validity' underlies the common practice among independent bishops of multiple consecrations *sub conditione* in order to unite as many strands of orders into their person as possible.[121] This certainly seems part of Nichols' motives, as he almost immediately begins ordaining other bishops *sub conditione* after his *de facto* installation as head of the AOCC. Individuals like Turner, on the other hand, genuinely felt themselves to be Orthodox, with Turner having left an independent church to become Orthodox under Ofiesh. The recognition that his church was in a state of schism resulted in a very different approach on his part, not only to the question of Western Rite Orthodoxy, but to his own episcopal ordination; the experience of Bishop Germain and his seeming desire to assert his episcopal identity and independence caused his relations with the Romanian Church to suffer to the point of schism. In this author's opinion, it was this very different approach to being both a bishop and Orthodox which provided Turner's church with some measure of stability until his death, while other churches dissolved their connexion to Orthodoxy within months of their reception. Still others, like those Western rite parishes of the ROCA, including the ECOF to some extent, were victims of changing opinion and their fates were beyond their ultimate control.

In many ways, the future of the Western rite in North America is still uncertain. Even in jurisdictions where the Western rite is long established, it has largely survived under the supervision of one hierarch, and it is difficult to determine what may happen should he leave. In the ROCOR, the Western rite is still a primarily monastic phenomenon, and for the rite to ensure a future, there will need to parishes which can produce individuals acquainted with Western rite monasticism and willing to take profession in a Western rite house. While numerical growth is hardly the solution to

[121] Cf. Robert A. Jones, *Independent Sacramental Bishops* (Berkeley: Apocryphile Press, 2010). Such consecrations are not always regarded as valid and can be regarded as a deficient understanding of the Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican doctrine of apostolic succession since one's succession is valid if they are properly ordained with proper intent with specific jurisdiction, even if only titular, and this is certainly a simplification of the very complex question of sacramental validity in all three Churches. There are also those within the Independent Catholic Churches which regard the attempt to acquire multiple lines of succession in order to ensure validity are at the very least unhelpful and are, at worst, distractions to the great potential benefits which independent bishops have to offer.

every potential ill, a very small core of committed individuals can easily be neglected or even shuttered off as circumstances permit. This is certainly the lesson from Overbeck's experience: lack of numerical strength and hierarchical or synodal support has been the basic source of failure for each of the attempts at establishing Western Rite Orthodoxy over the past century and a half. The future is promising for Western Rite Orthodoxy if it will be able to capitalize on the present numerical growth and strengthen the orthodoxy of its new membership, but the future security of the movement may depend on its ability to articulate a vision of Western Rite Orthodoxy that is not dependent solely on resistance to post-Vatican II liturgical forms.

CHAPTER 4
ANTECEDENTS TO THE WESTERN RITE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY

The distinguishing feature of Western Rite Orthodoxy is the liturgy, specifically use of a liturgical tradition different from the majority of Orthodox churches. Part of understanding Western Rite Orthodoxy is understanding its liturgy, including the way the liturgy developed prior to the modern beginnings of Western Rite Orthodoxy, the relationship of the Western liturgy to the Eastern liturgy, and how problems that were perceived in the liturgy were resolved, especially as the latter affect the Western Rite. There are, of course, many fine histories of the Western liturgy,[1] so there is no need to reproduce them exhaustively. However, a brief survey of the two liturgical traditions in Western Rite Orthodoxy, specifically the Roman and the Anglican, concentrating on the form of their eucharistic liturgies, serves as helpful background for further understanding the Orthodox Western rite.

The Roman Rite

Histories of the Roman liturgy, particularly those written before Vatican II, were want to wax poetically about the timelessness of the Roman liturgy in their introductory chapters. The liturgy was something timeless, something which had been known already to earliest Christianity, the essential shape of which was modified only slowly, and only on a few occasions;[2] a similar view with regards to the Byzantine rite and the interrelationship of JAS, BAS, and CHR as modifications of the previous rite, in that

[1] Joseph A. Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, Two Vols. (Allen: Christian Classics, 1986); James F. White, *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003); Theodor Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); Frank C. Senn, *Christian Worship: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997); and Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), for example.

[2] Cf., e.g., Nikolaus Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Dogmatically, Liturgically, and Ascetically Explained* (St Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949), 374.

chronological order, though the traditional succession is far from established.[3] Problematically for our study of early Christianity, we find ourselves unable to trace a consistent path of development from the Last Supper to the extant liturgies we possess. This is partly due to disagreement as to what constitutes early Christian liturgy, with debate over the significance of documents like the *Didache* and this status as a liturgical text, and the precise pedigree and dating of individual texts.[4] What we do know of early worship is that there was incredible regional variety in the way Christian worship was conducted, especially the Eucharist, to the point that in the absence of an urtext it would be impossible to identify any sort of archetypal Christian liturgy at all.[5]

Most histories of the Roman liturgy begin with Justin Martyr's description of a eucahristic service preceded by baptism and the Sunday eucharistic service.[6] However, we should be cautious in stating too readily that Justin's descriptions are in fact a description of the Roman liturgy in the second century. Paul Bradshaw is correct in his applying an 'hermeneutic of suspicion' towards descriptions of early Christian liturgy, particularly those which occur in non-liturgical texts.[7] In the case of Justin's description, the text is not startling considering it provides only the broadest outlines and no actual prayer texts, and there is no good reason to conclude that what Justin describes is the Roman liturgy; based on his extensive travels, Justin could be describing the liturgy of some other location or was speaking very generally to a non-Christian audience.[8]

Equally problematic is the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* attributed to Hippolytus. Though purported to be the Roman liturgy in the third century, difficulties of dating and provenance create difficulties for that identification. There is debate on these point, with some concluding that Hippolytus is the authentic author of the *Apostolic Tradition* and others arguing for a fourth century, West Syrian origin for the document. While the *Apostolic Tradition* bears resemblance to later known forms of the Roman rite, there is considerable debate as to whether or not the resemblance is because the Church of Rome adopted the *Apostolic Tradition* as its liturgy at a later date or because the document is a

---

[3] Paul F. Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 108-9
[4] Ibid., 139-43.
[5] Ibid., 119.
[6] Justin Martyr, *Apologia prima pro Christianis* 67, *PG* 6
[7] Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worhsip*, 14-7.
[8] Bradsaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 63.

Roman document, aside from questions of the document's authorship.[9] If the *Apostolic Tradition* is not the earliest form of the Roman liturgy, this would mean the earliest textual witness to the Roman liturgy would be in the sixth century.

The earliest point we can certainly speak of a Roman liturgy without question of origin or dating would be the *ordines romani*, which describe the manner of celebrating the Eucharist and include some prayers for the celebrant.[10] Other texts, like the so-called Verona Sacramentary, though really a collection of liturgical booklets known as *libelli*, provided the texts for 'proper' liturgies throughout the year; however, it lacks most of the mass formularies for the first quarter of the year and no propers for Easter. Also important, though later than the earliest *ordines romani* or the Verona Sacramentary, are the 'Old' Gelasian (ca. 750) and Gregorian (ca. 800) sacramentaries, both of which survive only as hybridized Roman liturgical books which have been altered and augmented with various Gallican elements.[11] The work of reconstructing the textual history of the Roman liturgy from the second half to the end of the first millennium is a painstaking work, sorting through texts which are known only through copies several centuries older than the purported original, and is a significant volume work that remains undone.[12]

According to longstanding tradition, Gregory I the Great moved the 'Our Father' to its current position, reduced the litany to nine kyrie, and added *hanc igitur* to the canon.[13] In the later medieval period, there was a synthesis of the *Gregorian*

---

[9] Gregory Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr* (London: S.P.C.K., 1937) identified the third century anti-pope Hippolytus as the author of *The Apostolic Tradition*, and the identification stuck, as did the identification of *The Apostolic Tradition* as a third century form of the Roman liturgy, though more recent scholarship has found problems with both identifications. For further discussion of the dating, authorship, and relationship to the later Roman liturgy, see John F. Baldovin, 'Hippolytus and *The Apostolic Tradition*: Recent Research and Commentary', *Theological Studies* 64.3 (2003) 520-42; Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *On the Apostolic Tradition* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001); Paul F. Bradshaw, 'Who Wrote *The Apostolic Tradition*?: A Response to Alistair Stewart-Sykes', *SVTQ* 48.2-3 (2004), 195-206; and John Cerrato, 'The Association of the Name Hippolytus With a Church Order, Now Known as *The Apostolic Tradition*', *SVTQ* 48.2-3 (2004), 179-94.

[10] Joanne M. Pierce 'Evolution of the *ordo missae*' *Medieval Liturgy*, 5.

[11] Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources* (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1986), 65-78. The oldest Gelasian sacramentary is *Codex Vaticanus Reginensis latinus* 316, copied ca. 750, though it does differ from other Gelasian type manuscripts from the end of the eighth century as noted by Cassian Folsom, 'The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.), *HLS* I (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 248-51.

[12] Pierce, 'Evolution of the *ordo missae*' *Medieval Liturgy*, 14.

[13] Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* I, 58.

Sacramentary, the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, and the Gallican rite, at the behest of Charlemagne. As Charlemagne desired to emulate the liturgy of Rome, he ordered that Gregorian books be brought into his kingdom, copied and distributed to churches in his domain. However, these liturgical books were incomplete insofar as would be necessary for churches throughout the kingdom. The books lacked formularies necessary for the eucharistic celebration according to the Gallican calendar, so these proper elements were added as necessary, as were modifications to describe the celebration without a bishop, and subsequently augmented, to produce the manuscript versions extant to the present day. Another Pope Gregory, Gregory VII attempted to reform the Roman liturgy and restore its original simplicity by eliminating what he considered to be Frankish interpolations, but without significant success. [14]

However, it is important to remember that none of the liturgies ancient Christianity developed without any external influence. It is true to a certain extent that liturgies grew and developed as people in various localities reflected on the liturgy they possessed; it is equally true that Churches in the ancient world imported and exported liturgical celebrations, festivals, and practices readily, although they were not always willing to admit to such cross-fertilisation. Gregory the Great, while admitting the similarity of various elements between the Roman and Byzantine liturgies, nevertheless denies that these modifications are borrowed directly from Constantinople, claiming that

> ...in none of these things have we followed any other church. The custom here of saying the alleluia is reckoned to have been brought here from the church of Jerusalem by the tradition of Saint Jerome in the time of Pope Damascus...That I made the subdeacons go in procession unvested was an ancient custom of the church...We do not say 'kyrie eleison' after the manner of the Greeks and have never done...The Lord's Prayer is said straight after the eucharistic prayer for this reason, that it was the custom of the Apostles to consecrate the sacrifice of the offering by this prayer alone....So then how have we followed the customs of the Greeks by either resorting our own ancient practices or by making new useful ones, though by doing so there is no evidence our imitating others.[15]

Nevertheless, Baldovin detects the obvious influence of the Christian East in the liturgical tradition of the West, particularly in the processional practices and its

[14] Cf. Jungmann, *Roman Rite* I, 95-8.
[15] Gordon P. Jeanes, *Origins of the Roman Rite* (Bramcote: Grove Books, Ltd., 1991) 48.

terminology, which is directly borrowed from the Greek language (such as *litania*, *antiphon*, *kyrie eleison*).[16] Other, less obvious points, of continuity between the Byzantine and Roman rites include especially the form of the solemn prayers of the faithful which survived only in the Good Friday liturgy but may have originally been a part of the Kyrie at Rome.[17]

The most significant period of Eastern liturgical influence would come during the seventh and eighth centuries, when easterners made their way to Italy to escape invasion or theological oppression and when the papacy was dominated by a series of Greek and Syrian born popes.[18] During this period, a number of festivals previously unknown at Rome, but well known in the West, enter the Roman calendar. The more prominent examples include St Isidore of Chios, the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, and the Presentation of the Theotokos. None of these featured on the Roman calendar prior to the life of Gregory the Great, but became features of the Roman liturgy afterwards.[19] This is especially true for feasts of Mary which, while popular in Constantinople from an early period, do not arise in Rome before 590 and do not really gain traction until the seventh century.[20] Likewise, processions on great feast days, which were customary in Constantinople, begin appearing in the late sixth century, and are thoroughly attested to in *Ordo Romanus I*, which has a number attendants who's offices bear Greek names in Latin transliteration: staufoforoi/σταυροφόρι, the sub-deacon with the apostolos/απόστολος or deacon with the evangelium/εὐαγγέλιον, various acolyti/ακόλουθοι with objects they carried similarly having Greek names.[21] The Greek popes also increased the ceremonial surround the Pope himself, borrowing heavily from

[16] John F. Baldovin, *Worship, City, Church, and Renewal* (Washington: Pastoral Press, 1991), 142-3.
[17] The connection, though asserted, is not always certain. Edmund Bishop, *Historica Liturgica* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918), 116-136. See also Bernard Capelle, *Travaux Liturgigues II: Historie le Messe* (Louvain, Abbaye du Mont Cesar, 1962), 116-134 and Antoine Chavasse, 'L' Oraison super sindonem dans la liturgie romaine', *Revue bénédictine* 70 (1960) 313-323 for further developments of this theory. For the opposite argument, see Paul de Clerck, *La Priere universelle dans les liturgies latines anciennes* (Aschendorff: Münster, 1977), 282-95. Baldovin in *The Urban Character of Christian Worship* (Rome: Pontificum Insitutum Studorium Orientalium, 1987), concludes that the kyrie was derived from the synapte rather than the ektene.
[18] For the Greek Popes, see Andrew J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Pope: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papcy From Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590-752* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007).
[19] Ibid., 17-8.
[20] Ibid., 261-4.
[21] Ibid., 253. See also John F. Romano, 'Ritual and Society in Early Medieval Rome' (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2007), 129 ff.

imperial ceremony and transitioning the liturgy of the City of Rome to the early form of what we might call the Papal liturgy.[22] Even the words, *mysterium fidei*, though strongly associated with the Roman *veba* were originally an Eastern consecration formula, quite possibly Syrian and added during the reign of any of a number of Greek popes.[23] The administration of the sacraments were also subject to Eastern influence, as attested in *Ordo Romanus XV*'s authorisation to celebrate baptism during Epiphany, something previously unknown at Rome but common in the East,[24] as were the appearance of solemn Paschal Vespers during the pontificate of Vitalian.[25]

But Eastern influence need not be construed only as imitation, as opposition to Eastern practices also have their influence on the Roman liturgy. One specific example would be adopting *agnus dei* during the pontificate of Pope Sergius. The Council of Trullo (691) forbade the depiction of Christ as a lamb, and in response Sergius not only inserted the hymn into the ordinary of the Roman liturgy, he restored a mosaic now entitled *Worship of the Lamb* in St Peter's Basilica, which had previous fallen into disrepair.[26]

The last major point of influence of the Eastern liturgy on the Roman rite before the reforms of Vatican II came during the eleventh century when the Roman Church finally adopted the recitation of the Nicene Creed during the liturgy for the coronation of the Holy Roman Emperor Henry II, who refused to be crowned if the Creed was not sung.[27] The Creed was adopted through indirect influence rather than direct pressure from the Christian East. Creeds were already common in the celebration of baptism in the ancient Church, and the Roman Church had its own specific creed which was used, but the first instance of the Nicene Creed during the eucharistic liturgy arose in the East when

---

[22] Ibid., 249.
[23] Johannes Brinktrine, 'Mysterium Fidei', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 44 (1930) 493-500.
[24] Michael Andrieu '*Ordo Romanus XV*' § 28 in *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age III* (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1974), 150. *Ordo Romanus* XI instructs the deacon to profess the creed in both languages, Greek first for the Greek infants and then in Latin for the Latin infants, which is evidence of more Eastern influence on the Roman liturgy (Andrieu, 'Ordo Romanus XI' §62-§66, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age II* (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1948), 434-5).
[25] Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes*, 165.
[26] See Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 35. See also Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes*, 223 and Leo D. Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 286). The other Western practices abrogated or condemned are considered in greater detail in Chapter 10.
[27] Bryan D. Spinks, *Western Use and Abuse of Eastern Liturgical Tradition: Some Cross-Sections of Its History* (Rome: Center for Indian and Inter-Religious Studies, 1992), 22

Patriarch Timotheos of Constantinople, a Monophiste, inserted the creed into the liturgy as a means of shaming his Chalcedonian opponents.[28] When a Chalcedonian subsequently took the office of Patriarch, the Creed was retained as a demonstration of the orthodoxy of the Chalcedonian position. From there, the recitation of the Creed spread to other Eastern Churches, eventually being introduced to the West via the Spanish Church, which had taught the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son as a guard against Arianism.[29] Ironically, this indirect Eastern influence on the Christian Church would itself contribute to increasing alienation of the East and West as the adoption of the Creed with the *filioque* at the Church of Rome, which had previously resisted its inclusion in the Creed during the eighth century.

The Roman rite was not the only liturgy used in the Christian West, but it was the liturgy that came to dominate the ritual life of the Western Church. The Roman liturgy is sometimes called the Roman-North African rite, because it is presumed that the North African rite had a similar shape and textual features as the Roman rite.[30] The other significant liturgical family in the West was the Gallican rite, used in the churches of Gaul and other Frankish lands. As we have already seen, the Gallican rite was ultimately fused with the Roman rite, though parts of this liturgy, like office and individual local propers, survived for several centuries after Charlemagne's edict importing the Roman rite. However, it is difficult to speak of the Gallican rite as such since, despite its importance, our first description of the liturgy is from St Germanus of Paris (555-76),[31] while the earliest fragments are from a century later and not easily disentangled from the Roman forms. The three other important liturgical families in the West were the Celtic rite, the Mozarabic rite, and the Ambrosian rite (sometimes also referred to as the Milanese rite). The Celtic rite was the liturgy used in Ireland, Scotland and Wales, though Brittany and northern Iberia have also been suggested as regions where the liturgy was used; this rite survives only in reconstructions of varying quality. The Mozarabic rite was the liturgy used in most of Iberia during the Visagothic period, today surviving only in a

[28] Hugh Wybrew, *The Orthodox Liturgy* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990), 84-5.
[29] Robert M. Haddad, 'The Stations of the Filioque', *SVTQ*46.2-3 (2002) 214-5.
[30] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 137, 142.
[31] Ibid., 144-5.

chapel in Toledo and a few other locations.[32] Faring far better is the Ambrosian rite, which is still actively used in the Archdiocese of Milan, a feat all the more remarkable given Milan's proximity to Rome.[33] In terms of origins and inter-relationships, whether any of these liturgies constitute separate liturgical families or should been seen as variations of either the Roman or Gallican rite (or if the Gallican rite should be regarded as the variation rather than the other way around), the question is not definitively settled and it is beyond the scope of the present work to consider the matter extensively.

Even where the Roman rite was primary liturgical form, each locality modified aspects of the rite to suit local circumstances, such that there was one ordinary of the rite, but multiple uses with regards to the proper elements. These modifications included changes to the calendar or lessons, inclusion of different propers, the arrangement of the church and its furnishings.[34] Though sometimes referred to as rites, the technical term 'use' is to be preferred to rite since the structure of the ordinary is not significantly modified. It is also worthwhile to mention that many medieval religious orders had their own form of liturgy for celebrating the Eucharist, including the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carthusians, but it is important to point out that the basic outline of the ordinary followed the Roman *ordo* closely enough to be classified as a use of the Roman liturgy. Most of these distinct liturgies have been abandoned following Vatican II, though the Carthusian liturgy is actually used.[35]

The Council of Trent, convened to create a response to the various Protestant churches and undertake its own reform, naturally covered the subject of the liturgy, specifically the mass. Abuses in the mass, real and perceived, had been a concern for Protestants and Catholic humanists alike, though what specifically were identified as abuses varied from group to group. In the session covering the doctrine of the mass, the Council considered the question of mass abuses, identifying the use of legendary content in propers, excessive use of the votive mass, superstition in the sequence of masses for

---

[32] Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, 372-3, n.3

[33] However, the Ambrosian rite was revised after Vatican II to conform to the norms described in *Sacrosanctum Concillium*. The reformed liturgy is noteworthy in that it has two Eucharistic prayers which place an epiclesis after the *verba*.

[34] Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982), 585.

[35] However, the Cathusian use has been reformed as well. Simultaneously, there are many Western Rite Orthodox who are interested in the Carthusian use because it of its presumed antiquity

the dead, and the payment of mass stipends were all identified as problematic.[36] However, the council itself did not reform the liturgy but, in the twenty-fifth session entrusted the reform to the Pope. Pope Pius IV, and Pius V after him, modified the liturgy of the Roman curia, reforming it on the lines required by the council in the attempt to return the Roman liturgy to its patristic simplicity.[37] What was unique about the current reform was the ability to enforce the single use throughout the Western church due to the earlier invention of the printing press. The new liturgical books could be easily copied and distributed widely with far less difficulty than previously possible, a level of standardisation considered desirable in some quarters but opposed in others.[38] The new missal was made obligatory for all dioceses and religious orders who could not demonstrate their liturgy had been in continuous use for the preceding two hundred years; in reality, even rites of known antiquity were threatened with extinction or their celebration was severely curtailed in favour of the papal liturgy that would more fully dominate the Western Church than ever before.

Though Pius V has seemingly forbade further changes to the liturgy,[39] further developments in the liturgy did occur periodically. Standardising liturgical books for celebrating the sacraments and other ceremonies of the church had not been explicitly commanded by Trent, but these were issued as well with the *Pontifical Romanum* in 1596 and *Rituale Romanum* in 1604.[40] Changes were made to the mass itself as new saints appeared in the calendar, from either new canonisations or restorations of previous commemorations suppressed under Pius' reform of the calendar. The setting for mass evolved as well into the baroque form now commonly associated with post-Tridentine Catholicism, providing for a visually sumptuous setting for the liturgy. This was in

---

[36] Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* I, 133-4

[37] Nathan D. Mitchell, 'Reforms, Protestant and Catholic' in Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen Westfield Tucker (eds.), *The Oxford History of Christian Worship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 337. Of course, this significantly simplifies the thoroughness and nature of the reform itself, but descriptions of the reform are available in other sources. The significance of the Tridentine reform will be discussed in the context of Western Rite Orthodox and its claims about the liturgy in Chapter 6 below.

[38] Ibid., 337-8.

[39] Ibid., 337. This point, however, needs to be qualified in that it is likely reference to diocesan bishops changing the liturgy of their own initiative rather than the Pope or his delegate. The precise meaning of Pius' injunction would cause debate subsequent to the liturgical reforms of Vatican II, with some traditionalists groups claiming that Pope Paul VI had no authority to alter the mass, and in fact was forbidden by Pius statement here, to altar the liturgy. Such claims obviously rest of shaky canonical grounds, but are used by some as a basis for delegitimizing *NOM*.

[40] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 388.

keeping with the prevailing aspects eucharistic celebration in the era: while the frequent communion was officially encouraged, in fact it was a rarity, with most Catholics experiencing the Eucharist with their eyes and ears rather than their mouths.[41] There were also conflicts over the rigid standardisation of the Roman rite, with bishops in France modifying the liturgy under the influence Jansenism into what is sometimes called a Neo-Gallican liturgy, though having little to do with the historic rite of the first millennium.[42]

Changes to the ordinary of the mass did come in time, with Leo XIII decreeing three prayers be added to the mass after the Last Gospel in 1886. Though the prayers had little to do with the actual liturgy of the mass,[43] they do reflect something of the spirit of nineteenth century Catholic liturgy, which was done for the faithful as they were occupied with their own devotions; the Leonine prayers reflect those private devotions, unrelated to the mass, that the faithful performed while the liturgy took place.[44] However, the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century also saw new approaches to the mass, with some theologians again actively calling for frequent communion (which was then regarded as a 'Benedictine innovation'[45]) and celebrations partly using vernacular. Reforms had been taking place since the beginning of the twentieth century: the breviary had been modified in 1911 and the Sunday propers were less frequently replaced by those for the saint's festival. The more significant change was in the Triduum and Easter Vigil which was reformed in 1955 by requiring a single paschal candle instead of the triple candlestick, celebrating the Vigil mass on Saturday after nightfall rather than on Saturday morning, and shortening the readings from twelve to four, plus the Epistle and Gospel. The most significant change came on 13 November 1962 when Pope John XXIII added the name of St Joseph to the canon which had until then been regarded as an unchangeable and immutable element of the liturgy.[46]

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, issued 4 December 1963 at the start of the Second Vatican Council, mandated changes which went beyond the wildest dreams of

[41] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 36-7, 62.
[42] Ibid., 31.
[43] Cf. Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, 455 ff.
[44] Ibid., 455.
[45] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 88
[46] Ibid., 115.

the liturgical reformers: intercessions were to be restored, communion could be received in both kinds and received by the faithful during the Mass, vernacular was mandated for at least part of the liturgy, and priests could concelebrate under limited circumstances.[47] More importantly, the *Constitution* required that the liturgy itself be reformed, envisioning that some parts would be omitted and other parts restored to what they had originally been.[48] The new missal was issued in 1969 and was obligatory at Advent that same year. The work of reform would continue through 1984 when the revised ceremonial for bishops was issued.

Even though there were many in the Roman Catholic Church who felt that liturgical change was desperately needed, there were many who were opposed to the changes for varied reasons. Some felt that there had been too much of a Protestant influence on the liturgical changes, with the liturgical reformers adapting many of the liturgical reforms desired by the sixteenth century reformers, though as James White notes, the Protestant churches quickly repaid the compliment by modifying their own liturgies in conformity with the new Roman rite.[49] Many were also concerned that the changes to the ordinary text of Mass were either an abandonment of the Catholic tradition entirely or were at a minimum sacrilegious; this was especially true for those changes which were felt to reduce the previously clear teaching of the real presence and the of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. There has been at least one schism from the Roman Catholic Church related in part to the revised liturgies which remains unhealed despite the Vatican rescinding excommunications of the four secessionist bishops of the Society of St Pius X in 2009. Within the Catholic Church itself, there were occasional allowances for the continued celebration of the Tridentine rite, beginning in 1971 with what is known colloquially as the 'Agatha Christie indult' since Pope Paul VI reportedly (and probably apocryphally) granted permission to celebrate the Tridentine rite in England and Wales when he noted her name her name on a list of petitioners. Pope John Paul II expanded permission for bishops to allow celebrations for the faithful who desired them in 1984

[47] Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. §50-§58. *Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 155-7.
[48] Ibid., §50. *Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 155.
[49] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 100.

with *Quattuor abhinc annos*,[50] and encouraged said permissions in a *motu proprio* entitled *Ecclesia Dei adflicta* in 1988.[51] Pope Benedict XVI issued *Summorum Pontificum* in 2007 fully liberalising the celebration of the Tridentine rite by devolving authority to authorising the celebration from the bishop to the parish priest.[52]

Western Rite Orthodox generally fall into the category of those groups who oppose the revised Roman rite, even though the AWRV was constituted before Vatican II was even convoked. Nevertheless, Western Rite Orthodox have maintained an over hostility reminiscent of various Traditionalist Catholic groups; their specific rational for their opposition will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

The Book of Common Prayer

Liturgically, the other significant stream influencing Western Rite Orthodoxy is Anglicanism, as TIK was adapted from the 1928 American *BCP* communion office. Morning and Evening were also adapted prayer from the American prayerbook for use as a form of the Western rite Liturgy of the Hours. The development of TIK is itself only a more recent stage in the attempt to develop a solidly Catholic liturgy within certain segments of Anglicanism, so it is important to consider the development of the prayerbook.

The Reformation was slow in crossing the English Channel, and only arrived for reasons unrelated to the ninety-five theses Luther nailed to the door of the Wittenburg Church on 31 October 1517; Henry VIII had even authored a tract against Luther's theology which earned him the title *Fidei defensor* from the Pope Leo X. However, Henry's dynastic worries would so conflict between the King and the Pope. Henry believed his marriage to Catherine of Aragon to be illegitimate and therefore a source of divine disfavour because Catherine had previously been his brother's wife but allowed to marry Henry by special dispensation. Henry was concerned that the inability to produce a male heir and stabilize his dynasty was a result of the marriage, and so Henry sought to divorce Catherine. Pope Clement VII was dependant on Catherine's nephew, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who had already captured Rome on one occasion. Henry

[50] Four Years Ago. *Quattuor abhinc annos*. Pope John Paul II. 03 October 1984.
[51] With Great Sadness the Church Has Learned. *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*. Pope John Paul II. 02 July 1988.
[52] Of the Supreme Pontiffs. *Summorum Pontificum*. Pope Benedict XVI. 07 July 2007.

VIII coerced parliament into legally severing ties between the English Church and the Papacy in 1534, though this itself was the result of a long process towards undoing papal authority in England. Liturgical change was also slow in coming, though there a few reformed devotional works which appeared early after the breach, notably John Hilsey's primer, which was published in 1539.[53] More dramatic than changes to the liturgical texts were changes in the way the average person expressed their piety, with the closing of several monasteries, the exposure of false relics, and forbidding pilgrimages. Perhaps the most dramatic events were the 1538 destructions of St Thomas Becket's shrine at Canterbury Cathedral and the holy house at Walsingham, both important pilgrimage sites in Medieval England.[54] Early reforms were otherwise relatively modest: mass was still celebrated in Latin, priests were still required to remain celibate, and communion was given in one kind.[55]

When Henry's son succeeded his father as Edward VI in 1547, the reformation cause could proceed at a more rapid pace. Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, had already suppressed devotions deemed superstitious beginning as early as 1536,[56] and a new processional appeared in 1544, preceded by the publication of a new breviary.[57] With Edward's ascension, Cranmer's Protestant sympathies need no longer be hidden, and he engaged in a number of liturgical experiments, such as suppressing ashes at Ash Wednesday and palms at Palm Sunday, rendering the canticles into English and translating the Epistles and Gospels, and adding English communion devotions to the Latin mass, all culminating in the publication of *The Booke of Common Prayer*, which became obligatory on 9 June 1549.[58] The new prayerbook was not merely a translation of the old Latin liturgy into English, but a skilful weaving of the old traditions, Lutheran and Reformed ideas, and influences from the Eastern church and the patristic literature, though the Continental Reformed influence was a dominate force.[59] While less drastic

---

[53] Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters', in Wainwright and Tucker (eds.) *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 492.
[54] Cf., e.g., Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).
[55] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 371.
[56] Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters', *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 494.
[57] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 371.
[58] Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters' in Wainwright and Tucker (eds.) *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 494.
[59] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 373.

and the Continental Reformed liturgies, the new prayerbook was a sudden, radical departure from the old beliefs.[60] Still further changes were on the horizon and further reforms were made to the liturgy, resulting in the 1552 *BCP*, made obligatory on 1 November of the same year, which taught a new eucharistic theology designed to downplay the real presence of Christ in the elements.[61] This book was short-lived, as Edward died in 1553 and was replaced by Henry's daughter by Catherine, Mary, a Catholic, who returned to the Roman rite during her five year reign.[62] After her death, Henry's daughter by Anne Boelyn, Elizabeth, a Protestant, became queen and consequently England broke yet again with the papacy.

With the ascension of Elizabeth, the prayerbook was restored as the official liturgy of the English Church in 1559. However, the 1559 *BCP* was not a reissue of the 1552 *BCP*, as the new edition included three important changes: a rubric was provided allowing, theoretically, for eucharistic vestments, though this was later undone by royal injunction; the communion administration formula was modified, with the 1549 version preceding the 1552 version so that both would be recited together; third, the black rubric from the 1552 *BCP* was eliminated.[63] The prayerbook was part of Elizabeth's larger religious policy which sought to balance the more Catholic-minded within the Church with the dogmatic views of the Reformed party. The confessional document of the Church, the thirty-eight (later thirty-nine) Articles of Religion are studied pieces of theological ambiguity, and have been compared unfavourably to the Emperor Zeno's *Henotikon*.[64] Unfortunately, the Elizabethan prayerbook failed to satisfy those known as the godly, also known as Puritans, who sought a more radical reform of English worship and polity to something similar to the continental Reformed tradition. However, as long

---

[60] Gordon Jeans, 'Cranmer and Common Prayer' in Charles Fefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds.) *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer* (Oxford: Oxford Unviersity Press, 2006), 26.
[61] Ibid., 31-3.
[62] Mary's reign, historically regarded as the last gasp of dying Catholicism in England, was actually more interesting and vibrant than there is space to discuss here. However, see Lucy C. Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) for a more nuanced interpretation of Catholic religious activity during Mary's reign.
[63] The black rubric was a last-minute insertion into the 1552 *BCP* which acknowledged that kneeling to receive the sacrament was acceptable though directly stated that no adoration or worship was paid to the sacrament because of kneeling. The rubric was specifically designed to demonstrate that the Church of England did not believe in or teach transubstantiation, and its omission in the 1549 *BCP* was consequently a point of contention for Presbyterians.
[64] Aidan Nichols, *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 17-8.

as Elizabeth reigned there was little headway for the reformed cause. The godly clergy attempted to modify the prayerbook, either by making *ad hoc* changes to the book or by printing emended editions which omitted elements which seemed minor, and thus could remain undetected, but were in fact significant improvements from their perspective.[65] Most godly objections to the prayerbook rite included making the sign of the cross at baptism, the use of the surplice, the giving of rings at marriage, and bowing at the name of Jesus.[66]

When Elizabeth died and was succeeded by James I and VI, the godly hoped that as a Scottish monarch, he would reform the reform the English church along Scottish, and therefore Presbyterian lines, while Catholics hoped he might sympathise with their plight, having himself been the offspring of a Catholic; both groups were gravely disappointed.[67] The King was inclined towards conformity between the Scottish and English Churches, but preferred the English practice, including the episcopate, to the Presbyterianism of Scotland. In response to a petition from the godly clergy, James did call a conference of godly clergy and bishops to undertake some reform of the prayerbook, though the 1604 *BCP* was essentially a reissue of the 1559 book;[68] the major concession to the godly was a rubric prohibiting baptism by laymen and midwives.[69] The godly were dissatisfied by the new book and attacked it openly; that is not to suggest that they were opposed to liturgical prayer, only that they opposed liturgical prayer which they disapproved.[70] The majority of the lower clergy in England were broadly Calvinist,[71] and for these the 1604 book was unsatisfactory, but there were Catholic-minded individuals among the higher clergy, increasing in numbers throughout the seventeenth century, who also found the 1604 *BCP* to be flawed. The prominent among these high churchmen was Lancelot Andrewes, successively bishop of Chichester, Ely, and finally Winchester, who developed a high sacramental theology and, at least in private, was willing to modify the

---

[65] Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters' in Wainwright and Tucker (eds.), *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 501-2.
[66] Ibid., 504.
[67] Nichols, *The Panther and the Hind*, 55-6.
[68] W. Jardine Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteeenth Centuries* (London: SPCK, 1958), 18.
[69] Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies, and the Stuart Divines* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2002), 34.
[70] Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies*, 1-2, n.2.
[71] Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters' in Wainwright and Tucker (eds.), *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 504-5.

prayerbook's text and ceremonial to suit sensibilities that are more catholic.[72] Charles' Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, was especially concerned with reintroducing Catholic ceremonial into the prayerbook liturgy.

The bishops in Scotland, drafted a new liturgy between 1616 and 1619 which survives, and attempted to reform the prayerbook for the Scottish Church based on the 1549 *BCP*, which only served to create problems religiously and politically.[73] The 1637 Scottish *BCP* itself, expressing advanced ceremonial and sacramental sensibilities, was doomed not based on what it said, but because it was issued by the bishops; the conflict was over two irreconcilable ecclesiologies, and not just sacramental theology.[74] Because the book was issued by episcopal authority, it could not be accepted by Scottish Presbyterians, and served to join them with Calvinists, Congregationalists, and English Presbyterians against the monarchy and episcopate, resulting in the English Civil War.[75] Charles, along with William Laud, were executed at the order of Parliament and various aspects of the Elizabethan Settlement, such as the episcopacy and the prayerbook, were set aside by the victors for the *Directory of Public Worship* in 1645. However, the directory was not acceptable to the Congregationalists, who were the most numerous party in the English Army, and the majority of the English lay population considered the prayerbook acceptable in any case.[76] Thus, even though it was illegal, use of the 1604 English *BCP* continued secretly, and sometimes in the open.[77]

After Oliver Cromwell's death, the republican government quickly unravelled and Charles II was invited to return to England as King in 1660. However, the Presbyterians found themselves significantly weaker than when Charles I had first taken the throne as

---

[72] Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies, and the Stuart Divines*, 45-7.

[73] Parliament had accused William Laud of imposing the new prayerbook, though it is clear historically that the Scottish bishops acted of their own initiative, though in consultation with Laud. For his part, Laud would have preferred the 1604 English *BCP* so as to have a single use throughout the two kingdoms. See Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters' in Wainwright and Tucker (eds.), *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 508-9.

[74] Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies*, 8. Grisbrooke, while acknowledging that the prayerbook was doomed from the beginning to be disregarded, despite any merits it might have, he goes on to identify it as the first prayerbook which can truly be identified as 'Anglican' and recognizes the important role it will play in the development of the 1662 English *BCP*.

[75] Though economic and social factors also have a role in the English Civil War, the religious dimension was especially important. See Conrad Russell, *The Origins of the English Civil War* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1973).

[76] Spinks, 'Anglicans and Dissenters' in Wainwright and Tucker (eds.) *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 510-1.

[77] Ibid., 511.

they were studious ignored by the new Parliament. The prayerbook was reformed and reissued in 1662 and was appended to a new Act of Uniformity which required the new prayerbook as compulsory religious service, forcing many Presbyterians from the English Church.[78] The 1662 English *BCP* would remain the official liturgy of the Church of England, amendable only by act of Parliament, to the present.[79]

In England's North American colonies, the situation was similar. The official liturgy of the Church of England in the colonies was the 1604 *BCP*, first used at Jamestown in 1607, continuing through the Interregnum by special concession of Cromwell during the English Civil War,[80] and was duly replace with the 1662 English *BCP* when it was issued.[81] During and after the American War of Independence, found itself in need of a new prayerbook. The 1662 English *BCP*, with prayers for the king and the royal family, were no longer appropriate in the new republican setting, and the clergy remained without episcopal oversight since there had been no bishop in North America. The Act of Uniformity had required and oath of allegiance to the king by the clergy, and without such an oath there was no opportunity to receive a bishop from the Church of England. However, the Scottish Episcopal Church was not bound by such strictures as it had been disestablished after the Glorious Revolution, and it was from the Scottish that the first American bishop, Samuel Seabury, received consecration in 1785.[82] One of the requirements for his consecration was that Seabury attempt to introduce the longer eucahristic liturgy from the 1764 Scottish *BCP*.[83]

---

[78] Ibid., 514.

[79] This is not to say that there was universal satisfaction with the prayerbook. For most of the intervening centuries, there were several calls for revision, as seen in Spinks, 'From Elizabeth I to Charles II' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.), *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, 93-105. The first real attempt came in 1689. More famous was the failed attempt in 1928, which won the approval of the Bishops but not Parliament. Subsequently, the 1928 Deposited Book was used informally in several English diocese, while formal prayerbook revision was forgone entirely, preferring instead to provide 'alternative' services to the official prayerbook.

[80] Judith Matlby, 'From Elizabethan Settlement to the Restoration' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.) *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, 89-90.

[81] Hatchett, 'The Colonies and States of America' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.), *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, 176.

[82] Parliament removed the legal barrier to appointing bishops who could not swear the Oath of Supremacy in 1786 with the Consecration of Bishops Abroad Act, so that the next two men elected as bishops, William White of Pennsylvania and Samuel Provoost of New York, were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1787. For the further early history of The Episcopal Church in the United States, see Robert W. Prichard, *A History of the Episcopal Church* (Harrisburg: Moorehouse Publishing, 1991).

[83] Hatchett, 'The Colonies and States of America' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.), *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, 178.

Seabury did introduce a modified version of the Scottish book at the 1786 convention that developed the church's initial constitution. However, a series of proposals to reform the 1662 English *BCP* along lines acceptable to evangelical Anglicans was also proposed. Seabury and other New England clergy refused the 1786 proposal because of its controversial suggestions, and the evangelical clergy would not accept the Scottish prayerbook, so a new attempt at creating a prayerbook was made. The model for the American prayerbook would be the 1662 English *BCP* with elements such as a modified form of the Scottish eucharistic prayer and updated language interspersed throughout the text.[84] The Philadelphia convention ratified the existence of the Episcopal Church as a separate entity, released all clergy from their oath of allegiance to the British monarchy, and accepted the 1789 American *BCP* as the official American prayerbook.[85] The prayerbook was imminently successful, remaining in place for nearly a century.

However, by the 1880s, several changes to the religious landscape indicated the need for reform. The first calls were social in nature. Already in 1830 there were calls to shorten the Sunday morning service which, consisting of Morning Prayer, the Litany, and Ante-Communion, was nearly two hours; this petition was brushed off by reminding clergy that the three services were in fact separate and one or more could be omitted according to local preference.[86] Religiously, the Oxford Movement was felt in America and further study, spurred by William Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae*, highlighted the need for changes.[87] While numerous and controversial reforms were put forward to the church's General Convention starting in 1883, the resultant reform was very conservative, with most of the changes affecting the Daily Office to make the 1892 American *BCP*. Consequently, calls for further reform began almost immediately, resulting in the 1928 American *BCP*. This reform was more radical than the 1892 edition, providing prayers for the dead, requiring the sign of the cross at baptism, removing the bride's promise to obey from the marital liturgy, and moving the prayer of humble access to immediately before communion as in the 1637 Scottish book, among a variety of lesser

[84] Ibid., 178-9
[85] For a detailed history of the 1786 American *BCP*, cf. Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer, 1776-1789* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982).
[86] Hatchett, 181-2.
[87] Edward L. Parsons and Bayard H. Jones, *The American Prayerbook: Its Origins and Principles* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), 54-5.

changes.[88] It is this version of the prayerbook that would serve as a basis for later Anglo-Catholic liturgical works and ultimately for TIK.

Western Problems, Eastern Solutions

Like the Elizabethan settlement itself, there was almost universal dissatisfaction with the 1559 *BCP* and its 1604 successor. The godly felt it to be insufficiently reformed while the emerging high church constituency quickly became dissatisfied with the book's Calvinistic features. Initially, there was a desire to reform the prayerbook on first ceremonial grounds, and later via textual amendment, to approximate more closely the form of the apostolic liturgy; this was the aim of the godly as well, though it is clear they had very different ideas about what was fidelity to the apostolic inheritance. The shifting stance of the Caroline divines can be seen as running parallel to their own ecclesiological conception of the Church: prior to the English Civil War, the Catholic-minded party in the Anglican Church, while not condoning Lutheran or Calvinistic ecclesiology, failed to provide them any approval of the same while after the Restoration, Luther and Calvin are condemned outright.[89] Liturgically, the prayerbook was considered textually fixed before the war, but was severely criticised after the restoration. Likewise, with the English Reformation itself, Caroline ecclesiastics like Robert Thorndike argued that the English Reformation had merely attempted to restore the primitive discipline of the English Church, though Henry VIII was unconcerned with real reform and the Elizabethan settlement was seriously defective.[90] Through no small amount of historical manipulation, the Carolines held that the Church of England maintained the historic doctrines, particularly with regards to the Eucharist as sacrament and sacrifice.[91] In this respect, Edward Stephens deserves particular attention for having pushed the boundaries of Caroline high churchmanship toward what would eventually become the Nonjuring sacramental theology;[92] John Johnson also deserves credit for his influence on the

[88] Hatchett, 'The Colonies and States of America' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, 184.
[89] Nichols, *The Panther and the Hind*, 72.
[90] Ibid., 73.
[91] Ibid., 66, 72.
[92] Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies*, 37.

Nonjuring ideas about the consecration and oblation which clearly affected the latter's liturgical practice.[93]

But, it became increasingly apparent to the post-Restoration divines and their successors, that there were particular defects within the prayerbook. This grew out of Caroline interest in the patristic literature. Furthermore, when many ecclesiastics with high church sympathies fled during the Commonwealth, they were able to compare the *BCP* to the liturgical texts they encountered abroad. Jeremy Taylor's *A Collection of Offices*, published to meet the need felt by the *BCP* suppression under Oliver Cromwell, seeks itself to refine English liturgy along more ancient lines.[94] But the Nonjurors would have more freedom to craft a liturgy based on the theology because of their particular circumstances. Following the deposition and exile of Charles II, a rupture opened in the Church of England between those who swore allegiance to the new king William III and those who, like Archbishop William Sancroft, refused to void their previous consecration oath to the former king since he remained alive. The result was a schism involving nine English bishops with four hundred clergy, all the Scottish bishops, and one Irish bishop who, because of their refusal to swear the oath to William, were known as Nonjuring.[95]

Liturgically, the Scottish bishops and the Nonjurors were in an unique position vis-a-vis the establishment. Though the 1662 English *BCP* was the liturgy for the established Church by statue, and thus subject to modification only by act of Parliament, the Nonjurors were not bound by such strictures and free to modify the liturgy as they saw fit; the Scottish bishops were in the same position since they were not the established Church in Scotland. There were those among the Nonjurors who recognized specific defects in the 1662 English *BCP*, which was still the primary liturgy for the Nonjurors; on 26 June 1716, these individuals petitioned the Nonjuring bishops to repair four specific defects: lack of oblation, lack of invocation (epiclesis), lack of prayers for the dead, and the restoring the mixed chalice.[96] The petition, along with the request for restoring the 1549 *BCP*, led to as split among the Nonjurors between those bishops and

[93] Ibid., 80.
[94] Ibid., 19-21.
[95] For further information on the Nonjurors, see Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1993), 71 ff.
[96] Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies*, 90.

clergy who preferred the revised forms (the Usagers) and those who continued using the unaltered liturgy, with the break lasting until 1732. The schism and subsequent partial healing are interesting in that they do not represent a dispute about doctrine, as might be assumed, but about whether the liturgy in use was an adequate expression of doctrines, particularly with regards to the oblation and epiclesis, with the actual *Instrument of Union* being a vindication of Usager claims.[97] Opponents of the changes, while agreeing with the underlying doctrines, were cautious about the restoration of practices deemed 'undesirable' and worried how far a return to primitive customs (in most cases, working from Chapter 8 of the *Apostolic Constitutions*) might go, perhaps even as far as giving milk and honey to the newly baptized?[98] No such practice was proposed, but it does demonstrate concern over where the Usagers' liturgical manipulation might lead.

The Usagers certainly had ample opportunity to consider older Eastern liturgical practices. Lancelot Andrewes and William Laud, via James Ussher, had set about acquiring Greek manuscripts, including liturgical books. Andrewes in particular possessed a copy of JAS and used it to compose his *Preces Privatae*. Other Anglicans like Thorndike and William Nicholson made efforts to study the lesser known Eastern liturgies, though they also studied CHR and BAS which were relatively well known.[99] During the Interregnum, many prominent episcopalians opted for exile in Europe rather than to remain in England and it was while in Exile that theologians like John Cosin and Jeremy Taylor were able to make extended studies of Eastern liturgies. Among the Carolines and later the Nonjurors, JAS and the Apostolic Constitutions were the most well known documents and had the most influence on their liturgical thinking.[100]

Looking at Eastern liturgy for inspiration, along with the need to settle their own ambiguous circumstances, naturally lead many Nonjurors towards the Orthodox Church.[101] Just as the Usager controversy was beginning to get underway, Archbishop Arsenios of Thebias who had been sent to England by Patriarch Samuel of Alexandria to raise money to cover the patriarchate's debts. Arsenios and his entourage quickly ran up

---

[97] Ibid., 114.
[98] Ibid., 117.
[99] Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox* , 18.
[100] Ibid., 23-4.
[101] Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies*, 54. This was not an unique phenomenon, as Edward Stephens had already concluded that 'The *Greek Communion*…[is] the only true *Catholick Communion* in the World…', which Grisbrooke sees as an anticipation the Nonjuror's attraction to the Orthodox Church.

an enormous debt without raising any significant funds. Most Anglican churchmen, suspicious of Arsenios' motives, were anxious to see the Greek prelate move on, even to the point that Arsenios was forcibly removed from the Bishop of London's presence on one occasion; few were unwilling to offer him any money.[102] However, the Nonjuring bishop Archibald Campbell suggested to his fellow Nonjurors that they should seek union with the Orthodox Church through Arsenios, though only Campbell, Jeremy Collier and Nathaniel Spinks actively pursued the matter.

The Nonjurors composed a list of items where they were in agreement with the Orthodox, points where there was disagreement, and the terms of their reunion with the East. The concerns of the Nonjurors ranged from the mundane to the retrospectively ludicrous; the petition covered a number of subjects, but the points which most concern us are liturgical. One request was that the British Church be permitted to return to its ancient use, presumably the 1549 *BCP*. Other, clearly more problematic items were that the Nonjurors insisted on rejecting veneration of the Virgin Mary or the saints and the use of icons, though an epiclesis was considered acceptable so long as transubstantiation was not thereby intended.[103] The Orthodox reply to the Nonjurors was not what the latter might have hoped for, given that the former demanded agreement on all disputed points before entering a union. With regards to liturgy specifically, the Orthodox Patriarchs stated that

> [the Nonjurors], as well as [the Greek Orthodox] should on proper days officiate by the Liturgy of S. Basil, and daily by that of Chrysostom. As for the English Liturgy, we are unacquainted with it, having never either seen or read it; but we have some suspicion of it, because many and various heresies, schisms, and sects have arisen up in those parts.[104]

While the reply was devastating enough, William Wake, the establishment Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to Patriarch Chrysanthos of Jerusalem informing him that the Nonjurors were a schismatic sect which did not represent the true Church of England, ending any hopes for union with the Greek Church.[105] Though the Nonjurors had also approached Tzar Peter the Great with their reunion plans in hopes of gaining support

[102] Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 158.
[103] Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 313-4.
[104] George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 34-5.
[105] Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 190.

from the Russian Church, his untimely death prevented any possibility for reunion on that front as well.[106]

What is specifically interesting about the Nonjuror correspondence is how it fits in with the Usages controversy.[107] Cambell, along with James Gadderar, prepared a communion office based on the 'primitive liturgies' mentioned in the petition to the patriarchs.[108] Though the question of sacrifice did not feature in the Nonjuror's initial inquiry to the patriarchs, it may underlie their concerns over transubstantiation. Similarly, no mention of prayers for the dead serves to indicate just how controversial these items were among the Nonjurors. For the Orthodox, there could be no disagreement on the matter, and where they suspected something behind the Nonjurors hesitancy to accept a doctrine, they ensured that the Orthodox teaching was clear as, in the case of purgatory, rejecting the idea of purgation but still stating that the Orthodox faith requires prayer for the dead.[109] The only item which is mentioned without issue is the epiclesis, though it is doubtful that if the negotiations had gone any further that the Orthodox would have been willing to budge on the other two points, which would have ended the matter anyway. Archbishop Alexander Rose freely admitted that the Scottish Church was not ready to accept prayers for the dead at all and to enforce them would result in the undoing of Scottish episcopalianism.[110] In the end, no compromise was reached, but the correspondence did have its effect, engendering stronger modifications to the liturgy, no matter how experimental or private.[111] The end result was that, at least for the Scottish Church, the epiclesis had become a standard fixture in their liturgy, and consequently in the American liturgy, even as the questions on prayer for the dead and eucharistic sacrifice remained.

---

[106] Cf. Christopher Knight, '"Had the Czar not Died": Peter the Great and the Nonjurors', *Sobornost* 11.1-2 (1989) 18-30.
[107] Collier and Campbell were among the Usagers; Campbell's election to the see of Aberdeen in 1721 was not ratified by the Scottish bishops because Campbell refused to not introduce the Usager liturgy in his diocese. See Henry R. Sefton, 'The Scottish Bishops and Archbishop Arsenius' in Derek Baker (ed.), *Orthodox Churches and the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 243
[108] Ibid., 243.
[109] Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*, 35.
[110] Sefton, 'The Scottish Bishops and Archbishop Arsenius' in Baker, *Orthodox Churches and the West*, 243.
[111] Ibid., 244 ff.

One other important attempt to rework the English liturgy came during the nineteenth century with the Oxford Movement and the subsequent controversy over ritualism. Tractarianism had a multi-faceted origin, including political and cultural factors in addition to theological issues,[112] but there was very little in the original form of the movement which was expressly concerned with liturgical matters.[113] Certainly, there was concern over items which might be broadly classified as liturgical, such as theology of the Eucharist, but these were typically divorced from their liturgical setting and it was only as the theological questions were settled that liturgical deficiencies began to be addressed. In the case of the Eucharist specifically, a developed theology of real presence only arose slowly, with affirmation that elements convey the presence of Christ in themselves first in 1836.[114] This view did not lead to a higher ritual sensibility, but it did lay the necessary groundwork for the ritualist movement since 'without [the doctrine of real presence] much of the ritualism in the following years would have been nonsense; with it, the ceremonies of reverence which accompanied the Eucharist and honoured Christ present in the Sacrament were inevitable.'[115]

Advancements in Ritualist practices are commonly dated to the 1850's, though began much earlier with the Cambridge Movement in 1839.[116] While similar to the Oxford Movement in its concern for correct theology and ecclesiology, it was equally concerned with the proper conduct and setting of worship; nowhere is this more prevalent than in the work of J. M. Neale, a member of the Ecclesiological Society and ardent liturgical innovator, notable for our purposes for his persistent interest in Eastern Christianity.[117] The exact extent of ceremonial innovation differed from parish to parish and in many ways from priest to priest, though we can separate the ritualist into two general camps based on general preference for Sarum-style or Tridentine-style modifications.[118] Most of the innovations, textual and ceremonial, were designed to

---

[112] Nichols, *The Panther and the Hind,* 114-9.
[113] Ibid., 126.
[114] Alf Härdelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist* (Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1965), 130ff.
[115] Lida E. Ellsworth, *Charles Lowder and the Ritualist Movement* (London: Dartmon, Longman, and Todd, 1982), 56.
[116] Ibid., 5.
[117] Cf. Litvack, *John Mason Neale and the Quest for Sobornost*, 4 ff.
[118] Matthew R. Johnson, 'Outward and Visible Signs: The Anglo-Catholic Liturgical Movement' (M.C.S. thesis, Regent College, 1986), 82-3.

emphasize the doctrine of real presence and eucharistic sacrifice.[119] Other modifications included prayers for the dead and invocation of the saints; the epiclesis, because it did not feature in the liturgies Ritualists adapted from, was not a significant consideration. Colin Stephenson has observed that, in the main, the Anglo-Catholic ritualists attempted to 'get in as much as possible of the Roman Mass as possible while appearing to use the *Book of Common Prayer*.'[120] This allowed elements not found in the prayerbook but present in the Tridentine rite to come into the Anglo-Catholic eucharist, especially the offertory and prayers for the dead via use of the Roman canon. What remained missing in the ritualist eucahrist was an epiclesis, perhaps because the Tractarian movement itself was less concerned with the Christian East than it was with the Western tradition.[121]

Where the Tractarians and the ritualists after them were interested in the Orthodox Church was when it could be utilised to support their claims regarding the Church of England vis-à-vis the Roman Catholic Church. Liturgically, this manifested itself in Anglo-Catholics attempting to read substantively more Eastern influence into the 1549 *BCP* than was really warranted.[122] Additionally, there were other attempts to link the English liturgy back to an earlier, non-Roman and ultimately Eastern form of the liturgy. John Henry Bluntt specifically claimed that the English liturgy was derived from the Gallican rite, which was not an adaptation of the Roman rite, but imported from the Church of Ephesus, and sometimes known as the Ephesine liturgy, or the Divine Liturgy of St John the Divine (or the Evangelist or the Beloved, or the Apostle), based on the Apostle's traditional connection to the city of Ephesus.[123] The ritualist modifications to

---

[119] Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 235-41.

[120] Colin Stephenson, *Walsingham Way* (London: Dartmon, Longman, and Todd, 1970), 110. He immediately goes on to observe that in the early part of the twentieth century, the situation was precisely opposite, with Anglo-Catholics attempting to use as much of the prayerbook as possible while still giving the appearance of celebrating the Tridentine Mass.

[121] Cf., e.g., Plato E. Shaw, *Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1930).

[122] Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 10.

[123] John H. Bluntt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer* (London: Rivingtons, 1866), 147. Bluntt, conclusions regarding the transmission of the supposed Ephesine liturgy have been adopted by Western Rite Orthodox to defend the distinct nature and antiquity of the Western Rite Orthodox liturgy derived from the prayerbook. Of course, there are problems with Blutt's thesis, notably that the existence of an Ephesine liturgy is entirely speculation, something not attested to in the Christian tradition prior to the nineteenth century, while it also ignores the fact that the Sarum use is a regional variation of the Roman rite and not of the Gallican rite. Furthermore, it is certainly beyond doubt that both the city of Ephesus, as an important early Christian centre, and the local Celtic Church in Britain (owing to its isolation from the continental Church) had their own liturgical tradition; however, it is quite another thing to demonstrate dependence of

the ceremonial and text of the liturgy, illegal though they may have been in the eyes of the establishment, had a significant effect on what was to become Western Rite Orthodoxy, since it was the Anglo-Catholic modifications to the prayerbook liturgy, and not the prayerbook itself, which would become the basis for TIK, as we shall see in the next chapter.

Anglicans are not the only body which have found their liturgical forms to be wanting for revision in one way or another. After the Old Catholic schism, various attempts were made at reforming the Roman rite for their use, though revisions were made independently by each Old Catholic national body, resulting in three forms in order of extensiveness of change: Swiss (1880), German (1888), and Dutch (1909).[124] Several minor changes were ultimately made, such omitting commemoration of the Pope, since the jurisdictional situation had changed, but are otherwise unrelated to the pattern already described. However, there were three elements that were consistently changed across rite and are relevant to our consideration, specifically: venacularisation of the liturgy, including saying the priest's parts audibly, insertion of an epiclesis, and removal of the *filioque*. The third change was made as a concession to the Orthodox,[125] while the second change is made under Anglican influence, as is evidenced by the epiclesis being inserted before the *verba*, the form provided in the 1549 *BCP*.[126] For other the vernacular form of the liturgy, it is difficult to determine how much of this comes, in principle, from the Orthodox example and how much is derived from the pre-existing impetus towards vernacular liturgy and liturgical reform generally which preceded the Old Catholic schism.[127] What can be determined with more certainty is that the liturgical reform among Old Catholics involved an interest in the earliest forms of liturgy in Christianity; in this regard, the Orthodox Church was seen as a potential influence, but only inasmuch

---

one upon the other. For that matter, knowing that these liturgies probably existed is entirely different from knowing what they were like textually. It is perhaps a sign of instability, based on current evidence, that all Bluntt's intellectual heirs have abandoned this thesis with the exception of Western Rite Orthodox who seek to demonstrate the antiquity of the prayerbook's antecedents to justify its conversion into an Orthodox liturgy.

[124] Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*, 320-6.

[125] Ibid., 268-9.

[126] Petrus Maan, 'The Old Catholic Liturgies', *Old Catholics and Anglicans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 87-8.

[127] Albert E. Rüthy, 'The Place of the Old Catholic Church in the Liturgical Scene' *SL* 2.1 (1963) 66-8.

as it represented the early Christianity tradition, and the liturgy itself seen alongside other items such as the *Apostolic Constitutions* or the the *Apostolic Tradition*.

Other Western churches were wrestling with similar questions. While the Catholic Apostolic Church, better known through the somewhat inaccurate label of 'Irvingite', shows expected similarity with the Roman rite and the *BCP*, there are also scattered hints of CHR, though dependency on the Eastern Church is not as significant as dependency on established Western forms.[128] The Irvingite liturgy was crafted by John Cardale, one the movement's Twelve Apostles, and in addition to modifying the liturgy on Eastern lines as in the previous attempts described above, such as insertion of an epiclesis and striking the *filioque*, he also inserted a rite of prosthesis at the start of the liturgy.[129] We have already encountered the Liberal Catholic Church in the previous chapter, and there is no need to describe them further. However, it is at least worth mentioning that the Liberal Catholics, in devising their liturgy, looked to Arnold Matthew Harris' translation of the Old Catholic Missal,[130] and as such indirectly inherited many of the changes that already existed in the Old Catholic liturgy, though it should also be pointed out that Wedgwood and his associates were critical of Christian antiquity as expressing the thoughts of a less enlightened culture, and were rather free with their adaptations of Harris' missal.[131] The connection to Western Rite Orthodoxy through Alexander Turner becomes apparent.

Conclusions

The Roman rite has its own distinct history apart from the various Eastern liturgies. At times, various eastern liturgies have influenced development of a Western liturgy, and significantly, this influence has come from what would ultimately develop into the Byzantine rite. However, this influence was no different from what was taking place in other parts of Christendom, as various rites mutually influenced one another throughout the first millennium. The other forms of western liturgy, such as the *BCP* and Old Catholic liturgies among others, are direct descendents of the medieval Roman rite and are directly shaped by the circumstances of the respective body's break from the

[128] Gregg A. Mast, 'The Eucharistic Service of the Catholic Apostolic Church' (Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1985), 31ff.
[129] Ibid., 34.
[130] Platt, 'The Liberal Catholic Church', 168
[131] Ibid., 168-70.

Roman church. Though the text of the liturgy has changed over centuries, the definitive pedigree is there by historic connection (the prayerbook) or from deliberate choice (Old Catholic).

However, when looking at those liturgies derived from the Roman rite and comparing them against both ancient forms of the Western liturgy and the Eastern liturgies, it became apparent that there were certain deficiencies which needed correction. With the Caroline divines, this included the notion of sacrifice, prayers for the dead, and the place of an epiclesis, with the first two questions resurfacing a century later among the Tractarians and Ritualists; for Old Catholics, the issues are the vernacular liturgy, the filioque, and the epiclesis. Within the Church of England, and consequently the prayerbook, the Elizabethan settlement dictated that the liturgy be somewhat vague to allow all parties to use the same liturgy in good conscience and thus maintain a single national church; this conscious choice was itself already found in the 1549 *BCP*, which has been described as deliberately vague.[132] Such circumstances were regarded by both Catholic and Reformed elements as undesirable, and each had their own ideas about how to work out changes to the prayerbook though both were prevented by statute (for the Catholic minded parties) and by political defeat (for the godly). Where Anglicans could develop the liturgy in a more Catholic direction were places that the church had been disestablished, first in Scotland and later in the United States. Here, the questions asked by the Caroline divines and the Nonjurors could be implemented, though not without considerable debate in either case. Where the liturgy was altered, it could be altered not by act of parliament, but by vote in the house of bishops, and with less concern for alienating more reformed elements within the Church. Thus, a variety of sources were opened for liturgical development, including ancient sources and the Christian East.

But, the questions regarding where the liturgy was specifically deficient were being asked since the seventeenth century; thus, when the Orthodox begin considering the possibility of a Western liturgy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they are asking the very same questions as the Carolines and the Nonjurors and the Tractarians. The Orthodox found seemingly ready-made solutions in the work of the

[132] Jeans, 'Cranmer and Common Prayer' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.), *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, 28. Jeans describes Cranmer's language as a 'kind of verbal incese that offers and attractive religious haze but no clarity of meaning.'

Anglo-Catholics and Old Catholics, solutions which seemingly needed only a few more modifications to be acceptable. Whether or not these solutions were always advisable, answered all potential contradictions or misunderstanding with Orthodox theology and spirituality, or faithfully preserved the Western liturgy is certainly subject to further question, and will be the focus of a later chapter. However, it is important to remember that problems in the Western liturgy, and their consequent Eastern solutions, were not always asked from the perspective of making the rites conform to Orthodox theology. Quite frequently, editors of various liturgies were seeking to recapture what they considered the genuine apostolic liturgy, based on limited sources and limited pre-existing research on the question, and not to make their liturgies more acceptable to the Orthodox. This is particularly apparent in the liturgical modifications made by the Nonjurors, but is also relevant to High Church attempts to connect the *BCP* in a line of unbroken tradition back not only to the pre-Reformation era, but even back to a pre-Roman liturgy and from there further back to the phantom Ephesine liturgy.

Before turning our attention to the correctness or effectiveness of changes in the Western Orthodox liturgies, we must consider the actual structure of those liturgies, how they differ both from each other and from their Western counterparts, as well as how they have evolved from the liturgy published by Overbeck to the present time. As mentioned in Chapter 1, we will focus our attention exclusively on the liturgies used by the AWRV. While there are certainly interesting elements to the liturgies used by the ECOF and the ROCOR, in order to consider the rite comprehensively, that is, as the sum of its most important liturgical acts rather than just the eucharistic liturgies, it is important to narrow the focus of study lest the entire discussion become bogged down in excessive detail. Thus, having begun with the antecedent eucharistic liturgies, we will continue on to the Orthodox Western rite eucharistic liturgies and their problematic elements and ancillary components (such as the lectionary and calendar) and move on to the other sacramental liturgies before returning to the questions about Western Rite Orthodoxy as a whole, particularly as manifested in the AWRV.

CHAPTER 5
THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGIES

The primary focus of previous studies on Western Rite Orthodoxy has been the eucharistic liturgies. Within the AWRV, there are two rites which have been approved for use: GRE and TIK. The former is a revision of the Tridentine missal while the latter is a revision of an Anglican liturgy. The eucharistic liturgies, along with various other services and formularies, are presently found in *TOM* or the *SASB*. These two works are presently the only two books authorized for liturgical use by the AWRV and the Antiochian Archdiocese, though other printings of TIK do exist in print from various sources. Each liturgy has its own specific history in terms of development within Western Rite Orthodoxy and so are treated separately.

Service Books

Historically, there are several different Western Rite liturgical formularies that have either been proposed or have actually been put into practice. Of these liturgies and service books, Overbeck's *Liturgia Missae Orthodoxo-Catholicae Occidentalis* is the oldest. For the AWRV, initial version of the liturgy was issued in 1961, with several corrections subsequently distributed in 1963 via *Orthodoxy*,[1] while subsequently publishing a new *Missal for Use of Orthodox* that same year. The latter edition is the only edition publically available, and only from a single source.[2] The *Missal for Use of the Orthodox* included GRE, the ordinary of Prime, Vespers, and Compline for Sundays, and a very short treatise on the Western liturgy. At present, there are two service books commonly available within the AWRV for use in the celebration of the various rites of

[1] Cf. AWRV, 'The Western Rite Vicariate: Liturgical Directives', Orthodoxy 9.9 (1963) 282-3.
[2] That is, from Youngstown State University Library. Unfortunately, the document is quite sadly falling apart at the seams. Other copies in better condition are probably available through private individuals, these are not readily accessible.

the Western rite: *TOM* and the *SASB*, with the latter having slightly greater availability and use.[3] There are other liturgical materials available related specifically to the eucharistic liturgy, all of which resemble the form in either of the two service books, and for that reason they will not be considered independently.

Though these are the primary liturgical books for the Western rite, there are additional texts that have been published periodically through the history of the AWRV. The first of these was a small volume entitled *TOR*. According to official notice at the front of the work, *TOR* was originally published in 1952 at the time when Turner was making the first approaches towards reception of the SSB into the Antiochian Archdiocese and was reissued in 1993, three years before *TOM*. The book serves an analogous function to *Rituale Romanum* in that it contains services other than the eucharistic liturgy and the office, specifically orders for baptism, unction, marriage, penance, and funerals. Furthermore, while *TOR* is related to *Rituale Romanum* by similar function, it would appear that *TOR* is not the direct descendant of one of the many editions of *Rituale Romanum*. The 1993 edition bears the marks 'English Ritual' at the tops of pages 67 and 69, and on page 30 there is a reference to *The English Missal*.[4] This would suggest that *TOR* was taken from one of several versions of *The English Ritual*, though the phrasing does not seem to match any particular version this author is familiar with.

However, we should be cautious in definitively stating that *The English Ritual* was the original source of *TOR*. Older editions of *TOR* are not available for review and therefore it is difficult to ascertain if the present edition is the first to conform to the English usage or this was the case from its inception. The introduction states that the ritual has been edited for 'flawed pneumatology, removal of references to persons venerated for careers outside of the Church, and doctrines or opinions alien to Orthodoxy.'[5] The second clause suggests that *The English Ritual* is the edited document

[3] *TOM* is only published by the AWRV and only available through St Luke's Priory Press, where as the SASB is published by the Antiochian Archdiocese. The SASB is available through a number of different retailers, but was also published to the internet (without the Psalter) in 1999 by St Michael's Church of Whittier, CA and is still available through their website.

[4] That is, according to my numbering. The 1993 edition of *TOR* does not contain any pagination, so I have added it here and at other places for ease of reference.

[5] *TOR*, 3. What precisely is meant by 'doctrines and errors alien to Orthodoxy' is never precisely stated and much of the original source material appears to have been retained without significant modification.

since it would have contained reference persons noted for secular accomplishments, although 'church' here might be understood as Christianity generally (necessary for the above conclusion) or it might be understood more specifically as Orthodoxy. Aside from that, there is no way to determine from the above comment alone that the first edition or that the second edition is an entirely new work, thus resulting in the need to relieve suspicions that it might be suspect.[6] That being said, there can be little doubt that the 1993 version is taken from some version of *The English Ritual*, either directly or through the 1962 edition and without much thought to editing the text, based on the evidence we have seen here

A much simpler matter is another small work entitled *The English Office*. Also published in 1993, this document directly states that it is a reprint of the offices from the 1928 American *BCP*, and a cursory reference reveals this to be absolutely correct. *The English Office* is distinguished from its counterpart in the *SASB* by not including the 'Collect of the Saints' and it retains the collects that are omitted by the *SASB*. There were also smaller tracts produced of TIK: 'The Divine Liturgy: Western Rite' and 'The Divine Liturgy of St. Tikhon' which are similar to the rite as contained in the *SASB*. Michael Keisler also includes reproductions of TIK and GRE in *Offering the Lamb*.[7] Several sections of *TOR* were also printed as pamphlets, likely for the use of the clergy and congregation during the celebration of some of the occasional liturgies. These include 'Christian Initiation' which contains the elements from *TOR* related specifically to the initiatory sacraments and 'Sick Call Ritual' with various liturgies, including visitation of the sick, blessing of a sick child, communion outside of mass (both 'general' and 'of the sick'), unction, the litany of the saints, commendation of a soul, and blessing of a woman in childbirth. Interestingly, the pamphlet omits the rite of extreme unction, baptism in case of emergency, and administration of viaticum, all of which are found in *TOR*. Some of the omissions seem reasonable (such as the litany), but the omission of extreme

[6] Although, given the nature of inclusions to Anglo-Catholic service books, one is left with a suspicious feeling even with regards to the supposed corrections. In the case of leaving references to *The English Missal* and allowing *The English Ritual* to remain at the top of two pages cannot be excused except as absolute carelessness on the part of at least the editors of the most recent edition. In that regard, if something so simple (and, in fact so obvious) is left unchanged, it leaves one to wonder what else has not been corrected. In that regard, what would be necessary is a thorough comparison of *TOM* to its original English version, though this seems a fairly tall demand in that the English version is nowhere identifiable.
[7] Keisler, *Offering the Lamb*,100-21for TIK and 122-41 for GRE.

unction (more popularly known as 'last rites') and emergency baptism seems a little unusual as the pamphlet is a small enough document to carry on one's person and thus have available in cases of urgent need. Among the ancillary materials for the liturgy, there is a hymnal specifically designed for Western rite liturgy: *The Saint Ambrose Hymnal*. *The Hymnal, 1940*, which was originally published by The Episcopal Church, is recommended in some literature of the AWRV for use by Western rite parishes.[8] There is also a smaller musical arrangement of '*Missa Pro Defunctis*' that was published by St Luke's Priory Press.

In addition to the authorized service books, there are also books and manuals which, while unauthorized for use with the AWRV, are nevertheless promoted and used by adherents of the Western Rite movement. The primary source for these materials is a small publishing venture in Denver, Colorado by the name of Lancelot Andrewes Press. The press primarily describes itself as promoting the traditional liturgy of English Christianity,[9] and there is a link to the Press's website from St Mark's Church. Based on the physical address, the offices of the press are co-located with St Mark's. The business of the press primarily consists of offering reprints of now out-of-print public domain liturgical resources, though they also have a small selection of devotional items, including an icon of 'St' Charles.[10] Some of the books which are offered for sale by the press are of more immediate interest to the study of Western Rite Orthodoxy, among them a reprint of the *Monastic Diurnal*, a early twentieth-century manual of the day offices from the Liturgy of the Hours based on the Benedictine and *BCP* uses.[11] Additionally, the Press offers a spiral-bound reprint of the eleventh edition of Henry Calrncross' *Ritual Notes*. Among materials available from large volume publishers which

[8] See especially AWRV, 'Practical Tips for Moving to Western Orthodoxy' (Stanton: St Luke's Priory Press, 2000), 4.
[9] Cf. Lancelot Andrewes Press, 'About us'. <<http://www.andrewespress.com/about.html>>
[10] That is, King Charles I who was beheaded during the English Civil War and canonized by the Church of England after the Restoration. The veneration of Charles among Anglo-Catholics in particular is well known, though obviously the cult of an Anglican monarch would be an anomaly within Orthodox Christianity. Considering the goal of the publishing house is to promote greater knowledge of English Christianity rather than Orthodoxy specifically, there is insufficient reason to make a greater spectacle of the matter.
[11] The book for the liturgy of the hours is *The Monastic Diurnal*, a modification of the *BCP* to align the text with the day offices as prescribed in the Benedictine Rule; this is a reprint of an earlier document of the same name. The other text, that of the liturgy, is actually a modified version of the 1928 *BCP*, aligning it with the present uses of the AWRV and entitling it, directly enough, *The Book of Common Prayer*.

are of interest to Western Rite Orthodox include Fortescue's *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, in part because of its popularity with Anglo-Catholics, but also because of its exhaustive description of the Tridentine rite, and Klaus Grambler's various books criticising *NOM*. Additionally, Fortescue's other writings are sometimes cited by Western Rite Orthodox to advocate for their adaptation of the Tridentine rite over and against *NOM*.

The Eucharistic liturgy has, by far, received the most scholarly attention in previous studies of Western Rite Orthodoxy. Both Smith and Woolfenden focus on the *SASB* in their respective studies and is consequently the measure by which Western rite the liturgies of the AWRV are critiqued. However, reference to the *SASB* as the standard liturgical document of the AWRV has not gone without disapproval. Benjamin Andersen has significant criticism for Woolfenden's focus on the *SASB* rather than *TOM* since the latter, he points out, is the authorized Western rite service book within the AWRV, while *SASB* dismissed as a 'simple parish prayerbook.'[12] *TOM*, published in 1996, does include a letter from Metropolitan Phillip which states that *TOM* is the 'only authorized service book for the Archdiocese'.[13] The *SASB*, published in the current edition one year following, has a similar letter authorizing it as a service book.[14] The matter is only further complicated by the fact that the annual Western rite *Ordo* mentions TOM as the approved edition of TIK, but also states that GRE is to be used from 'The Missal for Use of Orthodox' or 'an authorized version'.[15] Thus, we are left with the situation wherein there are seemingly three authorized uses of GRE, one of which is unavailable and one of which would simultaneously contain an unauthorized version of TIK if the *Ordo* is read literally and Andersen's claim is accepted.

There are at least a few other reasons for considering the validity of both *TOM* and the *SASB*. In the first place, when *TOM* was published in 1995, it would have been the only authorized service book as it had been published before the *SASB* (which was published a year later in 1996). In that regard, when *TOM* was published it was the only

[12] Andersen, 'An Anglican Liturgy in the Orthodox Church', 19.
[13] AWRV, *TOM*, 2.
[14] Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 1.
[15] AWRV, *Ordo*, 2008 (Stanton: St Luke's Priory Press, 2007), p. ii, referenced here as an example; all other Ordo's contain similar language, including those published immediately after the introduction of *SASB*.

authorized service book, but that in itself cannot be read to preclude the development of a later service book in addition to or superseding that volume. Secondly, while *TOM* has everything needful to celebrate the Eucharist (lections, propers, mass texts and the like), it lacks any forms for the celebration of the other sacraments. Therefore, it is to be assumed that there are some other liturgies or ritual forms for the celebration of the sacraments that are also 'authorized.' Again, reading 'only' to mean the exclusion of all other books, as Andersen claims, would consequently exclude *TOR* as well. Furthermore, while the *SASB* does have a full text for the celebration of each of the sacraments and that could be the 'authorization' that is referenced, though it seems unlikely that only non-eucharistic texts would be authorized by the metropolitan to the exclusion of the ordinary of the mass that is also included in the volume. In addition, the *SASB* contains no lectionary, meaning that a parish would be unable to function exclusively relying on one book or the other. Finally, the third edition of the *SASB* contains an imprimatur specifically referring to the services as 'authorized'; it seems unlikely that the Archdiocese would have permitted the imprimatur repeated if it were in error.

This latter point deserves explanation in that the edition of the *SASB* familiar to Andersen, Smith, and Woolfenden is not the third edition, but the second edition. The two editions do not vary from one another to the point that even the pagination is identical between the two versions. In light of the above, it would therefore seem that Andersen's purpose is in fact simply to dismiss the arguments which Smyth and Woolfenden make against the liturgies of the AWRV in their praise of the revised Gallican rite rather than respond to their claims directly. Thus, the argument that the *SASB* is not authorized at all or is at the very least not to be preferred to *TOM* rings hollow when one considers that the former has been reissued whereas the latter still has not. However, to prevent similar methodological criticisms of the current work, this author will refer to *TOM* primarily, with reference to specific variants in the *SASB*.

Divergences between *TOM* and the *SASB*

But what is the significant difference between the *SASB* and *TOM*, or any of the other publications of the AWRV related to TIK? According to Andersen, the *SASB* is a truncated version of the liturgy since

> The *Saint Andrew* text omits all of the priest's silent prayers (including the vitally important Offertory prayers), contains different and greatly simplified rubrics, inserts a threefold 'Amen' following the invocation of the Holy Spirit (apparently in imitation of Byzantine usage, a feature not found in *The Orthodox Missal* text nor indeed any other Anglican predecessor to the Liturgy of Saint Tikhon), and even omits a whole prayer from the Canon (the *Memento* of the faithful departed).[16]

Some of Andersen's statements clearly need qualification, since one is unsure why the offertory prayers are 'vitally important', at least more so than any other part of the liturgy, or why the addition of the threefold amen to the canon is in any greater form of discontinuity than the inclusion of bells during the canon, something also not known in any authorized Anglican liturgy. It is also difficult to determine precisely what would constitute 'greatly simplified rubrics' since no examples are provided. Certainly, as will be noted, the rubrics are different in places, but this author is not certain that it constitutes a simplification as much as an objective difference.[17]

The basic differences between the texts are as follows. In the *confiteor*, *TOM* opens the *indulgentiam* in the interrogative form ('Wilt thou not turn again and quicken us, O God?') whereas the *SASB* has the opening in a declarative form ('Turn us, again, O Lord, and quicken us'). The form used in *TOM* is the form used in *The Anglican Missal: American Edition*. The *SASB* places the ascent to and reverence of the altar and the introit between the invitation to prayer and the collect for purity. *TOM* preserves the direct link between the invitation and the collect, with the introit said or sung between the collect and the summary of the law. Additionally, *TOM* preserves the silent prayers of the celebrant, including *aufer a nobis* and *oramus, te* as they are given in *The Anglican Missal*, whereas *SASB* omits both of these private prayers of the celebrant entirely. The text in *TOM* is similar to *The Anglican Missal*, but not precisely the same. Furthermore, the introit is appointed to be sung after the private prayers of the celebrant, either during or after the censing of the altar.

Though the differences are minor, there are still a few distinctions between the *SASB* and *TOM* in the Liturgy of the Catechumens. The ninefold Kyrie is provided in

[16] Andersen, 'An Anglican Liturgy in the Orthodox Church', 19.
[17] For the text of TIK, both from *TOM* and the *SASB*, as well as the ordinary of *The Anglican Missal*, see Appendix 2.

both books, but with different preferences for language. In *TOM*, the Greek original is preferred with the English translation provided in parenthesis. The provision is reversed in the *SASB*, while *The Anglican Missal* provide them side-by-side, though only in the threefold. The 1928 American *BCP* only provides a threefold Kyrie in English. The *SASB* omits *munda cor meum* whereas *TOM* has retained it and the blessing/prayer prior to the reading of the Gospel. Both are found in *The Anglican Missal*, again with some variation as to the wording. *TOM* does possess something of a curiosity in that, while appointing the blessing to be administered to a deacon before proclaiming the Gospel, the missal itself omits the request for blessing found in the Roman rite, which served as the original source for this section as it is not a part of any prayerbook.

TOM possesses the full set of private prayers of the priest at the offertory that are in *The Anglican Missal*, again with minor differences in the specific word choice. While the *SASB* does omit everything from the invitation to prayer until *orate fratres*, it does make a provision for the celebrant to '[prepare] the offering of bread and wine with the appropriate prayers.'[18] However, there is no provision for the secret after *orate fratres*. Within the prayers of the people, both *TOM* and the *SASB* omit references to alms as a part of the opening to the offertory and have eliminated, along with *The Anglican Missal*, the offertory sentences. Though *TOM* does provide in the rubrics that 'the Offertory verse is sung by the Choir or said by the Celebrant'[19] before the private prayers, it does not provide them in the text of the liturgy or in the propers. Furthermore, both *TOM* and the *SASB* have inserted a specific petition for the Patriarch of Antioch, the Metropolitan of North America, and the synod of Antioch into the prayer for the local bishop that is in *The Anglican Missal*. This is not surprising since such an insertion would really be a fuller form of the prayer already found in both the Anglican Missal and the 1928 American *BCP*.

The most significant difference between the two parts is the omission of the *memento* in the *SASB*. Ostensibly, there seems to be no particular reason why this prayer would have been omitted unless it is somehow to be an indication that the priest is supposed to pray this particular portion privately (as we have inferred above in regards to

[18] Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 66.
[19] Ibid., 87.

the offertory prayers of the celebrant). There is no notice in the text that there is to be a private prayer said at this point, and the construction of the paragraph is that the two sections running into one another without break. Andersen is at least correct in his estimation of the seriousness of this omission since there seems to be no rational explanation for why *memento* is not included or acknowledged in some way, and the problem is only compounded by the most recent edition of the *SASB* not having corrected the problem. The inclusion of the triple amen after the epiclesis in the *SASB* is also unusual, but not quite inexplicable since the same interjection is located in the same place in GRE in *TOM* and the *SASB*.

There are also accusations of significant differences between the versions of GRE in the *SASB* and *TOM*. Schneirla lodges the same complaint as Andersen does against Woolfenden, though with explicit reference to GRE rather than TIK.[20] However, a close inspection of the two prayerbooks demonstrates that they are quite similar, though there are some differences. As with TIK, the *SASB* omits all of the offertory prayers, though there is still provision for their recitation even though they are not provided in the text and, unlike TIK, GRE require the use of the secret, though it is similarly not provided in the text. One curiosity is that *TOM* does not provide for a priest's text within the *confiteor*, though the *SASB* does. It is possible that the priest's confession is to be presumed from normal use, though the priest petitioning the other ministers for absolution would be an aberration according a strict reading of *TOM*. Additionally, as in TIK, *indulgentiam* is provided in the declarative form in the *SASB* but in the interrogatory form in *TOM*. However, unlike TIK, we can know liturgical prototype that the current liturgy would have come from. In this instance, the best translation would be the declarative sense used by the *SASB* if translated directly from Latin.[21] Finally, the silent prayers of the priest as he ascends to the altar are omitted by the *SASB*, though the reverences are still included. The *SASB* also omits *libera nos* after *pater noster*, though

[20] Schneirla, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Brief Response From Within', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 194, 196.
[21] However, it is not assumed that the texts of either *TOM* or the *SASB* were translated from the Latin original. It is considerably more likely that the text was taken from Turner's *Missal for Use of Orthodox* directly for the ordinary and supplemented with existing English translations borrowed from other existing sources.

the construction of the text presumes it has been said. Otherwise, the rites are identical, and it can be seen possess even less variation that TIK.[22]

So what is to be made of the differences? In the Tikhonite and Gregorian rites in *TOM* and the *SASB*, the overriding source of the differences seems to be the attempt to provide a prayerbook which is appropriate to and highlights the participation of the faithful in the rite. Since the *SASB* was originally produced as a congregational prayer book, one to aid them in participating in the liturgy in an era before *TOM* had been produced (and when Turner's missal was no longer widely available), that which is eliminated (or rather, not included) not only makes sense, it is to be expected. The *SASB* is not a missal in the same way that *TOM* is, but rather is a prayerbook, which is proper to the laity. Just as no parish priest would think of praying mass from the leaflets distributed to his congregation, so too the *SASB* was not and should not be treated as having everything which is necessary to pray the rite. Attempts to discredit Woolfenden's (and, by extension, Smith's) critiques of the rite based on reference to the *SASB* are mistaken. By and large, the only texts which are entirely omitted from the ordinary of the *SASB* which is found in *TOM* are the private prayers of the celebrant at the offertory, something the people do not participate in. The exception would be the omission of the *memento*, which itself is a grave problem as has been acknowledged above.

A much more serious problem for the *SASB* vis-à-vis *TOM* is the former's omission of the propers since such an omission significantly impairs the celebration of the rite from the *SASB* alone. However, the *TOM* also lacks functionality as it omits the texts for the celebration of the other sacraments. Thus, as we have seen, Schneirla and Andersen present a switch to undermine Woolfenden's arguments without actually addressing the challenges he makes. It is entirely reasonable that anyone wishing to make a general critique of the rites in principle, as Woolfenden does, could legitimately do so using the *SASB* based on the general similarity of the two texts. Where this principle is not practical is in making exhaustive comparisons between the liturgy as it is celebrated within the AWRV and the rite as it is/was celebrated by non-Orthodox. For this undertaking, to which we shall now turn our attention, an adequate effort could not be

[22] For the text of GRE, both from *TOM* and the *SASB*, as well as the ordinary of the Roman mass, see Appendix 1.

made without the use of *TOM*, though the official nature of the *SASB* prevents us from relegating it to unimportance as Andersen would have us do.

Liturgy of Saint Gregory

The Gregorian liturgy within Western Rite Orthodoxy really begins with Overbeck. The history of how and why Overbeck sought union with the Orthodox Church has already been provided in Chapter 2. Based on Overbeck's ineffectual attempts to have his ordination recognized the lack of a priest appointed to celebrate the Western rite, it is doubtful that this liturgy was ever actually celebrated. Thus, the honour of being the first edition of what we could identify as GRE is the mass used by Alexander Turner and the Society of Saint Basil when it was received by the Antiochian Archdiocese.[23] Turner's liturgy displayed some areas of variance with Overbeck's liturgy, and similarly the liturgies of the *SASB* and *TOM* display some areas of development when compared to the liturgy which Turner used. In particular, Turner's rite omits both the *asperges* and the Last Gospel, both of which were found in the current service books, meaning that they were added back in at some point. The *confiteior* is also shortened, with Turner suppressing references to Michael, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul and the other saints, a practice which is subsequently rescinded in *TOM* and the *SASB*. One interesting addition which is found only in Overbeck's mass is the inclusion of the trisagion 'in memory of our union with the Orthodox Church'[24] in Greek and Latin in the Latin ordinary, and Greek and English in the English ordinary.

As should be readily apparent, there have been some changes to the text of the Gregorian canon which distinguish its Roman counterpart. The first and most obvious change is the removal of the name of the Pope from the start of the canon, replacing it with the Patriarch of Antioch. Certainly, such a change is to be expected since it would be odd to find the Pope commemorated to the exclusion (or even addition) of the Orthodox bishops. Overbeck and Turner both included prayers for the Synod, but Turner's petition

[23] However, it is nowhere referred to as GRE. Rather, it is simply called the Western mass, the Western rite or, less frequently, the Roman rite. There seems to have been no need to identify it absolutely as there was no other rite of Western heritage within Orthodoxy to confuse it with. It is unclear precisely when the appellation to St Gregory within the name of the rite came about, but the absolute latest time would have been with the publication of *TOM*.
[24] Overbeck, *Liturgia Missae Orthodoxo-Catholicae Occidentalis* (London: Taylor and Co., 1871.), 7.

is specifically for the Synod of Antioch, and this wording has carried over into *TOM* and the *SASB*. The commemoration of the synod, whether generally or specifically, is certainly at variance with the Roman Canon, but also distinguishes GRE from CHR and BAS, both of which lack a specific prayer for a synod. One could speculate that Overbeck likely added a prayer for the synod since, when he was received by the Russian Church, there was still no patriarch, so the logical choice to replace the commemoration of the Pope would have been the commemoration of the Russian synod, and consequently the use passed into the Gregorian liturgy even though the original context had been forgotten.

What is more interesting is the commemoration of the Metropolitan of the Archdiocese, but no commemoration of the diocesan bishop, either in addition to or instead of the Metropolitan; in this regard, Turner, *TOM*, and *SASB* are at variance with Overbeck's canon, which retained the petition for the diocesan explicitly, rather than only the metropolitan or archbishop. This is perhaps because in the Antiochian Archdiocese, only the Metropolitan is commemorated unless another bishop is physically present since all bishops were/are considered to be auxiliary bishops rather than diocesans. Presumably, the diocesan would have been commemorated during the period where the North American Archdiocese consisted of internal dioceses, though the 2005 reprint of the *SASB* did not include that change.[25]

One interesting choice for Turner's canon was an inclusion of a prayer for the President of the United States. In the Roman canon, there have been no prayers for those in civil authority within recent history, though historically the Holy Roman Emperor was mentioned in part of the canon.[26] Overbeck's canon also included a prayer for the wellbeing of the monarch, but his prayer is included as a part of *commemoratio pro vivs* and not *te igitur*, which is a logical though incorrect arrangement. Though the Turner rite shows a number of influences in its rendering, there are several good reasons to conclude that the Liberal Catholic rite has made an impact on what becomes GRE, and the

[25] However, in 2009 there was controversy over the specific role of diocesan bishops and their place within the hierarchy (whether they were fully diocesan or only auxiliary bishops) and, consequently, whether the local hierarch was commemorated at all liturgies or only those where he was physically present. Until that time, it had been Antiochian custom to commemorate the local hierarch even if he were not present as if he were a diocesan bishop.

[26] Jerome Gassner, *The Canon of Mass: Its History, Theology, and Art* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), 227.

placement of this petition is evidence of that fact. In the Liberal Catholic rite, prayers for the temporal ruler are in *te igitur*. The practice itself is ancient, stemming from the fifth century[27] but was something that had disappeared from the canon of the Tridentine mass.[28] The connection between the two rites cannot be pushed too far since after the *commemoratio pro vivis*, the Liberal Catholic anaphora begins to diverge significantly away from the text of GRE and the Tridentine rite. As such, we can only speak of influence of the Liberal Catholic liturgy rather than direct modelling.[29] The *SASB* has specifically changed the petition to 'for the head of our State,' probably in an effort to make the prayerbook usable outside the United States.

With the exception of Overbeck, all Western Rites omit the naming of specific intentions as a part of the first section of *commemoratio pro vivis*, though there seems to be no specific reason for doing so. The Gelasian Sacramentary notes that 'within the action, where is said Memento…of Thy servants and handmaids, who…and there are to be recited the names of men and women who receive the infants for baptism'.[30] As such, it is a section of the canon whose antiquity is well attested. It has also been suggested that this would have been the location where the diptychs for the living would have been read in the Roman rite, based on similar phrasing in Antiochian rite, though this is not in other Western liturgies.[31] The suppression of prayers for special intentions is odd since both the Byzantine rite and other Western liturgies do retain the private prayers of the priest as a part of the intercessions within the text of the canon. One possible reason for this oddity is that if Turner were drawing on the Liberal Catholic rite, which makes the intercessions

---

[27] Jungmann, *Roman Rite* II, 157-8.

[28] Ibid, 158. There were exceptions, including in Spain and Austria, the latter continuing even up to the twentieth century. However, both of these places are majority-Catholic countries and in places where there was no catholic ruler (such as the United States where Turner lived, or in Great Britain where the J. I. Wedgewood, the compiler of the Liberal Catholic rite resided) and consequently no such petition included in the canon.

[29] Given Turner's background, such influence should not be a surprise since Turner started out as a priest in the Liberal Catholic Church before becoming disillusioned the theosophical doctrine of the church, as mentioned in Chapter 3. On the other hand, if one presumes that the Eastern liturgy would have exerted a subtle influence on GRE, it may be that the common point of reference is the source of the similarity rather than direct influence of one on the other. Wedgwood does claim that the Liberal Catholic rite was more influenced by the Byzantine liturgy than the Roman rite, though from the 1924 and 1942 editions of the Liberal Catholic Rite, it is difficult to determine precisely how this is so. Again, it is more likely that Turner retained that which he felt was beneficial within the Liberal Catholic rite where it diverged from Roman rite and discarded anything else.

[30] Gassner, *The Canon of Mass*, 228; see also Jungmann, *Roman Rite* II, 161-6.

[31] Cf. Gassner, *The Canon of Mass*, 228, and Taft, *The Diptychs*, 27-9.

optional, he could have eliminated them from his rite unawares and it would have followed into the present versions by means of simple repetition. This solution seems particularly satisfactory considering that Turner's canon (and *TOM* and the *SASB*) omits reference to specific saints that have been a part of the Roman canon from antiquity, though Overbeck's canon contains prayers for the saints by name.[32] The Liberal Catholic has no invocation of the saints in the canon, and the current service books make invocation by name optional. Here again, this would be odd considering the antiquity of the naming of the saints in the Roman canon were Turner not drawing off the Liberal Catholic rite as his model.

Perhaps the most significant variation of all Western Rites is the insertion of a descending epiclesis into the canon before *supplices te rogamus*. Turner, *TOM*, and the *SASB* all utilize the exact same wording for the inserted epiclesis. Overbeck's epiclesis is similar, though it varies slightly in wording. Overbeck also inserts an 'amen' from the deacon after the reference to the bread and again after the cup, in addition to the triple amen that all four versions have, though here again, Overbeck assigns the amen to the deacon whereas all other versions assign the amen to all. The epiclesis as it is currently rendered is not from any historic western rite, but rather is taken from CHR. Unlike all other rites, Turner presents the epiclesis as something which is to be said in a loud voice, whereas the other rites reserve the use of a loud voice only for the *verba*.[33] Overbeck has followed the original form more closely than the others in assigning statements to the

[32] All of the rites (except the Liberal Catholic) follow the Roman canon in naming the Theotokos first. However, the Roman canon goes on to specify by name Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon, Thaddaeus, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Chrysogonus, John, Paul, Cosmas and Damian as a part of *communicantes* and John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnes, Cecilia, and Anastasia in *nobis quoque peccatoribus* at the end of the canon. In both places, the naming of individual saints is optional in *TOM* & the *SASB*. The traditional lists of saints may have been deemed to be inappropriate for Western Orthodox since all the saints named are associated with the ancient Church of Rome. However, considering that the purpose of the Western rite is to allow Christians to worship in their traditional liturgical forms, veneration of pre-Schism Western saints, and because Western Rite Orthodox simultaneously claim the canon has gone unchanged since the time of Gregory the Great and invoke their continuation of the unchanged Western liturgies against *NOM*, this explanation rings quite hollow. What makes this omission more problematic is the mention of specific saints in the *memento* of TIK (at least in *TOM*) includes the Roman list as a mandatory part of the canon whereas such a list is absent from the *BCP*.

[33] In the Byzantine rite, the *verba* are also pronounced aloud while the epiclesis is said in a quiet voice.

deacon, though all of the current versions have suppressed the deacon's portions for reasons which are not easily determined.[34]

The preceding description is notably dependant on comparison between the GRE and the Tridentine rite as opposed to the liturgy commonly used in Roman Catholic churches after Vatican II. In some ways this is to be expected since Turner and the Society of St Basil were received into the Antiochian Archdiocese before the council was convened. In that sense, the preference for the Tridentine rite is a function of the time and place Turner (and obviously Overbeck) lived and performed most of their work. Despite that consideration, many of the authors of the recent period have taken the adaptation of the Tridentine rite as a point of pride, indeed as a preservation of the Roman rite in its historic glory from the ravages of a cast of unscrupulous characters.[35] At least in that regard, they are not entirely different from the various Traditionalist Catholic groups which have protested the Missal of Paul VI. We will consider the claims that Western Rite Orthodox have made specifically with regards to *NOM* in Chapter 10, but it is nevertheless important to point out that differences do exist between the GRE and the Roman Catholic liturgy for reasons of not only history but also preference.

Liturgy of Saint Tikhon

The most commonly held history of the Tikhonite liturgy is as follows: in the early part of the twentieth century, during his time as Archbishop of North America, St Tikhon presented the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church with a proposal to allow Episcopalian congregations which converted en masse to use a version of the *BCP* that was corrected according to Orthodox theology. To that end, he made the request that the Holy Synod review the 1892 American *BCP* to assess orthodoxy and determine what deficiencies would need to be corrected, deleted, or added. The Holy Synod issued a favourable, if tentative, reply but no Episcopal converts ever came forward and the matter was forgotten until 1975 when the Church of the Incarnation in Detroit, Michigan left the

[34] It may be that opposition to the reforms of Vatican II, which prescribed a greater role for deacons in the liturgy with the (re)establishment of the permanent diaconate has caused a negative reaction among Western Rite Orthodox, limiting the deacon's tasks to proclaiming the Gospel as a point of pride for their liturgy, even though the Tridentine rite allowed a more prominent role for the deacon if one were present.

[35] Cf. John Mangels, 'Orthodox Odyssey', in Michael D. Trigg (ed.), *Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy* (Ben Lomond: Conciliar Press, 1993) 20-27, and John C. Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*' (Denver: St Mark's Orthodox Church, 1999, <<http://www.westernorthodox.com/Lux-Occidentalis>>), 5.

Episcopal Church for the AWRV and began to utilize the *BCP*, revised along the lines provided by the Holy Synod, as their primary liturgy.[36]

The *RO* remain the standard for the evaluation of any Western Orthodox liturgy taken from the Anglican family in part because it is the only thorough and official reply of any Orthodox body as regards any perceived deficiencies in the theology or the text. Rather than making a fresh study of the matter the Church of the Incarnation was received into the Orthodox Church, the *RO* were cited as the standard for any adaptation of the prayerbook. Thus, TIK must be evaluated in light of the standards presented in the *RO*. Most of the subsequent attention to the *RO* has focused on the recommendations for the eucharistic rite, most specifically the supposed removal of the *filioque* and the addition of an epiclesis. However, because of the almost universal assumption that the two changes above were the most significant, even leading one to the conclusion that this was all that the *RO* required,[37] it is perhaps best to summarize the main points of the *RO* as they directly impact the Eucharistic rite:

- Removal of the filioque is required, though it receives barest mention, and even then not in context with the Eucharistic rite, but with the Litany and the Office.
- A clear and definitive expression of the belief in the change of the Gifts into the very Body and Blood of Christ.
- Explicit language to express belief in the Eucharist as a true sacrifice for the living and the dead.
- Invocation of the saints, especially the Theotokos.
- Prayer for the dead in additions to prayers for the living.

As one can readily see, there are not two changes which the *RO* require, but there are five which are established with the assumption that they are the minimum.[38] The first is the removal of the *filioque* as is normally mentioned in the 'two changes' list, but there is no mention of the epiclesis in the *RO* text. The *RO* do not use the word (or its Russian equivalent), though it does mention Holy Spirit in relationship to the prayerbook ordinal.

Immediately, one recognizes that there are three problems with the current use of the TIK: first, there is a distinct lack of emphasis on the *RO* in practice than suggested by Western rite apologists. This is epitomized by the persistent references to removing the

[36] Cf. Andersen 'Anglican Liturgy in the Orthodox Church'; Keiser, *Children of the Promise* and *Offering the Lamb*; Trigg, 'Preface', *SASB*, 2ed., 1996, among others.
[37] Cf., e.g., Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 6.
[38] *RO*, 2-7.

filioque and strengthening the epiclesis, despite the fact that the latter is nowhere called for in the text. Secondly, the prayerbook that was revised is not the 1892 American *BCP* which was actually sent to the Holy Synod for review. Furthermore, the revised text is not drawn directly from the 1928 American *BCP*, which replaced the reviewed edition of 1892. Rather, what is used is an adaptation of the 1928 American *BCP* known as *The Anglican Missal: American Edition*.[39] In its essence, *The Anglican Missal* is a modification of the *BCP* by adding elements of the Tridentine rite, including the rite of *asperges*, moving the Gloria to before the lessons, adding all the private prayers provided for the celebrant in the Roman rite, and the adaptation of the American *BCP* canon with elements from the Roman canon. All of these same elements have also come into the TIK. The third problem, closely related to the first, is that TIK, while based on the *RO*, is not St Tikhon's liturgy. Smith brings this point out in his critique of the liturgy[40] but it is worth pointing out that the problem is not with the naming of the liturgy for St Tikhon but with what is implied in the commonly held history of the rite. That the liturgy is given patronage and, by implication, authorship of an historical figure who did not compose the current rite should meet no specific consideration on the part of the scholar; it has been questioned whether or not John Chrysostom ever had anything to do with the rite which now bears his name, let alone having undertaken the work of actually composing the rite.[41] Equally problematic is the implications provided by identifying the liturgy with St Tikhon. Schneirla describes TIK as being '[one of] two texts long approved for use by major Orthodox authorities.'[42] No doubt, he is implying reference to the *RO*, but the *RO* provided no actual rite, only what was required to be removed and added so as to make the rite inoffensive. As the *RO* states,

> [the *BCP*'s] actual contents present very little comparatively that clearly contradicts Orthodox teaching, and therefore would not be admissible in

[39] Woolfenden claims that the liturgies were taken from *Missale Romanum*. While he is correct in a sense in that the additional prayers of the Anglican Missal were adapted from the Roman Missal, it is more likely that the present Tikhonite liturgy was taken from Anglican Missal as I am claiming. Certainly, given the reasons for Anglicans having come into the Orthodox Church subsequent to the changes in the prayerbook in 1979, his claim that the move of the Gloria from the end of the rite to its ancient place before the collects *in anticipation of the 1979 Episcopalian rite* can scarcely be substantiated. As noted above, the Gloria was moved to this position by *The Anglican Missal* and is therefore likely evidence of the use of *The Anglican Missal* as the basis for TIK rather than either the Roman Missal or the 1928 BCP.
[40] Smith, 'Review Essay: *Saint Andrews Service Book*', *SVTQ* 41.2-3 (1997) 252-3.
[41] Cf. Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 121-122.
[42] Schneirla, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Brief Response From Within', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 195.

> Orthodox worship. But this conclusion comes not from the fact that the book is actually Orthodox, but merely from the fact that it was compiled in a spirit of compromise….But worship which is so colourless (in its denominational bearing) cannot, of course, be accepted as satisfactory for sons of the Orthodox Church, who are not afraid of their confession of Faith, and still less for sons who have only just joined the Orthodox Church from Anglicanism.[43]

With that in mind, it should be apparent that the *RO* not only omits direct approval of the liturgy even with modest corrections, but it also does not state precisely how much would need to be added (at least in terms of in how many places) to the prayerbook generally or to the rite itself to make it sufficiently 'colourful' so as to be 'satisfactory for sons of the Orthodox Church'. That being said, there seems to be no reason to consider that *The Anglican Missal* provides sufficient colour, especially considering that the additions of the missal were uncritically adapted from the Roman rite while retaining elements that might be considered questionable, such as the Elizabethan formula for administering communion, simultaneously implying Calvinistic and Roman understandings of the presence of Christ in the sacrament.

The beginning of this chapter considered the ways TIK differs in *TOM* and the *SASB* and how both are distinct from their in *The Anglican Missal*. However, as the 1928 American *BCP* is at least theoretically the original source of TIK and the 1892 American *BCP* is the edition reviewed in the *RO*, we will consider the divergences of TIK from the *BCP*, omitting that which is common to TIK and *The Anglican Missal* which of necessity diverges from the prayerbook.

The order of the *BCP* opens with Our Father at the option of the celebrant, something which has been removed in all versions of TIK. Additionally, the Decalogue has been omitted from TIK, though it was still included in the 1928 American *BCP* and *The Anglican Missal*. The former contains a rubric which requires the recitation of the Decalogue at least one Sunday each month. Conversely, TIK provides for the singing of an introit, there is no such provision in the *BCP* since 1552.[44] The primary points of

---

[43] *RO*, 34.

[44] Massey H. Shepherd, *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 67. The 1549 prayerbook did contain the provision for the recitation of a whole psalm in place of the introit, restoring the ancient usage of the rite, but it was subsequently abandoned in favour of the arrangement of Our Father, Collect for Purity, Decalogue, and Kyrie. This was further revised by the 1979

continuity between the *BCP* and TIK are that both still retain the collect for purity, followed by the summary of the law, and concluding with the Kyrie, before the latter again moves on to the Gloria before going to the lessons whereas the prayerbook continues with the lessons directly.

The remainder of the liturgy of the word continues without significant deviation, except for the creed, where *filioque* has been omitted from TIK. After the creed, the two texts diverge again with a salutation and invitation to prayer followed by the celebrant's private offertory prayers in TIK. This salutation is not present in the 1928 American *BCP*, which instead provides a number of sentences of scripture for the offering, with no reference to any private prayers. Both texts do have the Prayers for the Whole State of Christ's Church, which was originally a form of the intercessions in the 1549 *BCP* and moved to its present position before the *sanctus* in the 1552 *BCP*.[45] These pro-anaphoral intercessions have been retained in TIK, along with the general confession and the comfortable words.

The majority of the canon, up to and inclusive of the *verba*, remains the same as it did from the prayerbook. The invocation in the 1928 American *BCP* and *The Anglican Missal* simply asks that God 'of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.' Both *TOM* and the *SASB* include the text of his prayer, but after reference to the gifts themselves inserts 'that they may be changed into the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.' This is probably the section referenced when Western rite apologists state that TIK has a 'strengthened epiclesis.' Objectively, the text inserted into the TIK canon places more emphasis on the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic gifts rather than shoring up any particular notions of how that presence is effected. This is perfectly in accord with the requirements of the *RO*[46] but it is unclear as to how this represents a stronger epiclesis. The removal of 'thy Word' from the prayer as it is found

---

prayerbook, which opens the rite with the Apostolic Greeting, the Collect for Purity, Gloria, and the Kyrie and Trisagion as alternatives to Gloria.

[45] Shepherd, *American Prayer Book Commentary*, 74.

[46] *RO*, 1-2.

in the 1928 American *BCP* since it was originally included to ensure that 'word' was acknowledged as the Divine Logos rather than the *verba*.[47] In that regard, the work of the editors on TIK has actually weakened the epiclesis that was in the prayerbook rather than giving it any sort of vigour.

The unedited use of 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving', which has not been altered in TIK when compared to the *BCP*, is something the *RO* cautioned against because of its lack of reference to sacrifice:

> It is true, in the American rite immediately after the Invocation there is placed the prayer 'And we earnestly desire,' in which one can find some sort of allusion to prayer for the whole Church; therein they entreat God 'mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' But remember that this same prayer is employed in the English edition as the prayer of thanksgiving after Communion and is read after it, one cannot fail to see how vague is the reference to sacrifice in it.[48]

Nevertheless, the paragraph has remained in the text of TIK without any edit. One place where TIK does conform to the requirements set forth in the *RO* is by adding *memento* from the Roman Canon into the prayerbook canon. However, this is another instance of inadvertent conformity in that the same element was already a part of *The Anglican Missal* before it passed into TIK.

Following the Lord's Prayer, TIK includes *Agnus Dei*, something absent in the 1928 American *BCP*, but was included in the 1979 American *BCP* at the same location. The Prayer of Humble Access is included, but the centurion's confession ('I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof') has been added from the Roman rite. From CHR, the prayer 'I believe and confess' has been added as a pre-communion devotion for all just as was done in GRE. TIK concludes with a dismissal, a blessing, and the reading of the Last Gospel before one final acclimation and implicit dismissal. The 1928 American *BCP* contains no dismissal whatsoever, but does conclude with a priestly or episcopal blessing after the singing of the Gloria.

[47] Shepherd, *American Prayer Book Commentary*, 81.
[48] *RO*, 5.

Conclusions

As we have seen, the two rites have undergone significant modification as a part of their adaptation for Eastern Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, TIK has undergone significantly more modification than GRE when compared to the original version of the liturgy. This is especially true if one ignores *The Anglican Missal* and the changes that were made to it so as to bring it into closer conformity to the Roman rite, not to mention the 1928 American *BCP*'s revisions to the 1892 American *BCP*, the only Anglican liturgy that was actually considered in the *RO*. The additions to GRE have been less extreme, but are still significant in some places. However, we must question whether all of the changes which have been made to these two liturgies are of equal validity and investigate whether the two rites were brought into strict conformity with Orthodox theology and spirituality? It is to these questions that we will now turn our attention.

CHAPTER 6
PROBLEMS IN THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGIES

While we have considered whether or not the changes to the above two rites are sufficient to make the liturgies in question Orthodox, one thing which has not yet been considered is whether or not the rites remain sufficiently Western in their alterations. That is not to suggest that any alteration to the rite would be contradictory to its Western character, though some of the changes which have been made GRE and TIK are more advisable than others. Each of the changes made to the rite can be placed in one of four categories: 1) changes to the rite that were deemed necessary and have been implemented; 2) Changes that were thought to be necessary but in light of further reflection are not essential; 3) changes that were deemed necessary and were not implemented; and 4) changes that were not mentioned but were made regardless. Some changes were necessary because of the new situation where the Western Rite Orthodoxy finds itself. By way of example, there can be little justification for continuing the commemoration of the Bishop of Rome in the liturgy since the Pope must be considered at least a schismatic from an ecclesiological point of view. Others changes such as adding 'I believe and confess' prior to communion were not strictly necessary[1] to make the rite Orthodox but added at the request of the hierarchy,[2] while others like adding the triple amen to the epiclesis were simply uncalled for but took place anyway. The current chapter is concerned primarily with those changes which fall in to category two.

[1] And, indeed, this embolism in particular has its own unique problems related to the Eastern rite as well since this item is itself a relatively recent addition to CHR. Thus, in the name of Eastern pietism, an Eastern 'vice' is imposed on the Western liturgy where it is not necessary and, since the embolism is recited by the faithful and not the clergy, it is an instance of conflicting ritual usages since the Greek-Byzantine tradition (which is used by the Patriarchate of Antioch, which the AWRV belongs to) assigns this confession to the priest and deacon while the Slav-Byzantine tradition assigns it to the faithful.
[2] Cf Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 5.

Epiclesis[3]

The necessity of 'strengthening the epiclesis' has been variously invoked as one of the requirements for making any Western Rite Orthodox. Among the most prominent changes to the Western Rite Orthodox eucahristic liturgy is the insertion of an epiclesis into the canon after the *verba*. The epiclesis, taken from CHR, is inserted into the GRE because the Roman canon lacks a 'proper' epiclesis, as is variously affirmed by different authors.[4] Partly, this is because of the symbolic place that the epiclesis, like the *filioque*, has received in the history of theological dispute between East and West. Consequently, that an epiclesis is necessary is sometimes simply assumed as an absolute and non-negotiable necessity. But unlike the *filioque*, the elimination of which can be assumed as a necessity for re/union with the Orthodox Church because of its late introduction into Western theology, the question of the epiclesis is more complex because it both strikes at the heart of presumed divergences of eucharistic theology and the historical integrity of the Roman rite.

Like much else in the history of the various rites of Christianity, we know comparatively little about the epiclesis in the ante-Nicene period, but our knowledge becomes more certain as we move into and past the fourth century. We do know that at some point, most Eastern liturgies came to have a section where the Spirit was invoked to come and sanctify the bread and wine of the oblation and make them into the body and blood of Christ. However, there is textual evidence that this feature was not always a part of the prayers over the oblation, either because it was not there or because the invocation was different from the later rites. It has been generally assumed that ancient texts did not invoke the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic liturgy in part because there are no parallel references to these invocations in the controversial literature of the second half of the fourth century, the argument being were there an authoritative liturgical tradition which deified the Holy Spirit, the Cappadocians would have invoked it. Yet, Edmund Bishop finds no evidence for any reference to a consecration epiclesis in the liturgy before Cyril

[3] This section appears as J. Turner, '"And We Beseech Thee to Send Down Thy Holy Spirit": History, Liturgy, and Theology in the Epiclesis Text of *The Divine Liturgy of St. Gregory*', *SL* 53.2 (2009) 202-215.
[4] e.g. Kevin Irwin, *Text and Context: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 70.

of Jerusalem's *Mystagogical Catecheses*.[5] This leads Spinks to identify three steps in the development of the modern epiclesis: 1) The Logos is invoked to come and manifest his presence; 2) the Father is petitioned to send the Logos or Spirit on the oblation; and 3) the Father is petitioned to send the Spirit to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.[6] Thus, we can distinguish between different types of epiclesis based on the subject petitioned to come: in instances where Christ or the Logos is one who comes, we would have a 'Logos epiclesis,' whereas the corresponding type where the Spirit is invoked would be identified as a 'Spirit epiclesis.'

While the Logos epiclesis might seem unusual, there are at least a few examples of it from liturgical history. We can see early evidence for the Logos type in the *Acts of Thomas*, the Maronite *Sharar*, and, as Spinks contends, probably in the original form of *Addai and Mari*.[7] Additional evidence is found in Ps.-Athanasius in the form of a catechetical homily by describing the transformation of the bread and wine by saying that 'as soon as the great prayers and holy supplications have been made, the Logos descends upon bread and the chalice, and they becomes his body.'[8] Taft indicates that this is probably a reference to a Logos epiclesis on the basis that if the Spirit type of epiclesis were known, such an epiclesis would otherwise be remarkable.[9] More certain is the *Euchologion of Sarapion* which invokes the Logos directly:

> O God of truth, let your holy Word come and dwell in this bread, so that the bread may become the body of the Word, and in this cup, so that the cup may become the blood of truth. And make all those who communicate in this life-giving remedy receive (it) unto the healing of all diseases, and unto strength for all their accomplishments and virtues, and not unto judgment, O God of truth, nor unto reproof and disgrace.[10]

---

[5] Edmund Bishop, 'Appendix' in R. H. Connolly (ed.), *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai Translated into English With an Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 137-47.
[6] Bryan D. Spinks, 'The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James', *SL* 11.1 (1976) 28-9.
[7] Spinks, 'The Consecratory Epiklesis', *SL* 11.1 (1976) 27.
[8] Athanasius *Frgmenta Alia* VII (*ex sermon ad baptizalos*), *PG* 26, 1324/5.
[9] Taft, 'From Logos to Spirit: On the Early History of the Epiclesis' in Andreas Heinz, Heinrich Rennings, and Deutschen Liturgischen Institut (eds.), *Gratis Agamus: Studien zum Eucharistischen Hochgebt für Balthasar Fischer* (Freiburg: Herder 1992), 495.
[10] Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thumis*: *A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995), 235.

So there is ample evidence for the existence of a Logos epiclesis in the ante- and immediate post-Nicene period and that it was accepted in orthodox circles.[11] However, while the Spirit epiclesis cannot be definitively attested to before Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses*,[12] the Logos epiclesis and its theology did not simply die out at the end of the fourth century, as is attested to by Jacob of Serugh who states that the Father is petitioned to send his Son.[13]

We can speculate to some extent on the process by which the older Logos epiclesis became supplanted by the Spirit epiclesis. Kilmartin identifies the decline of the Logos epiclesis as a result of the conflict over the divinity of the Holy Spirit between the *homoousian* party and the Macedonians or, as they are more appropriately called, the Pneumatomachi.[14] The Pneumatomachi's fates were largely tied to the Arians, and the ultimate defeat of the latter at Constantinople in 383 ensured that the former would not make a significant future expansion, though their legacy, and that of the Arians, is felt in the abandonment of the Logos epiclesis by the East during and after the fourth century. Simultaneously, the Roman rite rarely addressed public prayer to the Son, and much less to the Holy Spirit.[15]

An epiclesis may further be sorted as to type based on the primary end to which the invocation is directed. That is, whether the Logos or the Spirit is invoked, they are invoked to do something. Earlier forms of the epiclesis invoked the one sent to bless or sanctify those who were present that they would be able to receive the communion in a worthy manner and to their benefit. This earlier form is often called a 'communion' epiclesis. Later forms would invoke the Logos or the Spirit to come and perform some

---

[11] Cf. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion*, 235ff. wherein he argues for the antiquity, authenticity, and historic orthodoxy of the Logos-type epiclesis using *Sarapion* as the primary example.

[12] Though see Spinks 'The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James', *SL* 11.1 (1976) 29, wherein he reminds the reader that while the 'phraseology employed [in Cyril] might be 'still a novelty,' the idea expressed in the epiclesis is considerably older.

[13] Bishop, 'Appendix' *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, 137-47. One surviving aberration from the norm of Father sending the Spirit is the Anaphora of Gregory the Theologian, which is addressed entirely to the Son and petitions him, not the Father, to send the Holy Spirit. Albert Gerhards, *Die Griechische Gregoriosanaphora: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Eucharistischen Hochgebts* (Munich: Westfalen, 1984), suggested that there may have been an example of an otherwise widespread phenomenon. It is interesting in its own right for its uniqueness, but otherwise unremarkable for our present study.

[14] Edward Kilmartin, 'The Active Role of Christ and the Spirit', *Diakonia* 17.2 (1982) 98.

[15] Spinks, 'The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer: What Jungmann Omitted to Say' in Spinks (ed.), *The Place of Christ in Liturgical The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer: Trinity, Christology, and Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2008), 14.

action the elements of communion that they would be consecrated as the true body and blood of Christ; hence, it is known as a 'consecratory' epiclesis. Originally then, '[the epiclesis] was a prayer for the sanctification of the ecclesial communion, not for the sanctification of the sacramental sign'[16] but became an explicit prayer for sanctification over a period of time. The theological implications cannot be pushed too far since, as Taft reminds us, 'to call a text a "communion epiclesis", and not a "consecration epiclesis", is only to comment on the structure of its text and not in any way to infer that such a primitive, less explicit epicletic prayer is not, in fact, implicitly consecratory.'[17] Within the Byzantine rite, there are three epicletic texts for our consideration: CHR, BAS, and JAS. All three are of the Spirit-consecratory type, but each one utilizes a different verbal form in its petition to God for what the Spirit ought to do to the gifts. For CHR, the Spirit is petitioned to 'change' (μεταβαλών); in BAS, to 'show' (αναδείξαι); and in JAS, 'make' (ποιήση). Of the three, JAS is most similar to the type of epiclesis described in Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses*, and Spinks speculates that Cyril may have been describing JAS when delivering his catechesis.[18]

The difficulties between the East and West regarding the significance of the epiclesis stem from the Western Scholastic attempt to define a 'moment of consecration' of the Eucharistic elements.[19] Prior to the fourteenth century no major disagreements existed between East and West regarding the consecratory function of the epiclesis,[20] but the beginnings of the dispute are discernable in Nicholas Cabasilas' *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* and in Pope Benedict XII's *Libellus 'Cum dudum' ad Armenios*. Tensions wee exacerbated at the Council of Florence where Latin theologians insisted that the *verba* were consecratory, whereas Greek theologians argued that while the *verba* are necessary, they are not exclusively consecratory. However, the origin of the conflict itself may not be liturgical or theological, but is seemingly political since the initial attacks come from areas subject to Western missionary activity in the fourteenth century.[21] McKenna suggests that because of the Latin emphasis on the *verba* as consecratory,

[16] Taft, 'From Logos to Spirit', *Gratis Agamus*, 492-3.
[17] Taft, 'The Epiclesis Question', *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, 215.
[18] Cf. Spinks, 'The Consecratory Epiklesis', *SL* 11.1 (1976), 19 ff.
[19] John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit The Eucharistic Epiclesis in Twentieth Century Theology (1900-1966)* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, Ltd., 1975), 72.
[20] Ibid., 73.
[21] Ibid., 75.

subsequent Orthodox theologians began to take the position that the epiclesis alone is consecratory, though in the twentieth century there was a renewed emphasis on the *verba* and the epiclesis together as consecratory.[22] The concern here is not the dispute of East and West over the importance or necessity of the epiclesis, which is simply taken as a given in much of Orthodox theology.[23] Rather, our primary consideration is whether or not any change to the Roman or Anglican rites are necessary or if the canon is acceptable in an unaltered form. In that regard, we will look primarily at GRE since it was into this liturgy that an epiclesis was inserted so as to make it Orthodox, [24] an alteration that I will argue is mistaken.

Since GRE has been taken from the Roman rite, we should begin by looking at the subject of the epiclesis in the Roman rite. The first question to be posed is whether the Roman canon ever had an epiclesis of similar shape to that in the Byzantine rite (that is, a Spirit-type consecratory epiclesis) and, if so, when and why it was removed from the liturgy. In looking through the surviving manuscript evidence, we can see that the canon itself, at least at this point, has survived remarkably well through the centuries. The earliest manuscripts of the Gelasian Sacramentary possess a canon which is identical to later Roman sources, so, at least by the sixth century, the Roman canon was essentially of the same form that it is today. Going beyond manuscript evidence of the sacramentaries, Parsch concludes that the Roman canon originally contained an epiclesis, though he bases his assertion on presence of an epiclesis in *Traditio Apostolica*.[25] The identification is problematic and current scholarship has cast doubt on the origins of *Traditio Apostolica*, its attribution to Hippolytus, and its third century composition.[26] It is beyond the scope of this work to approach the question of whether *Traditio Apostolica* is the authentic progenitor of the Roman canon or not but given the doubts that exist, the absolute

[22] A related question which has arisen recently is whether the proper verb at this point is (offering) or (we offer). Historically, the latter translation has been preferred, but the former makes the clause dependent on the response of 'we praise' by the laity, thus providing them with some part in the epiclesis. While it does not directly affect the notion of if the epiclesis alone is consecratory or if the consecration is brought by the *verba* and the epiclesis together, it does show new thinking about the extent of the epiclesis within the Orthodox liturgy.

[23] For a more in-depth discussion of the history of dispute over the epiclesis, see McKenna, *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit*, 48-90.

[24] TIK was also modified, though in this case the epiclesis was already present within the text and was altered to remove any reference to the 'Word' from the text.

[25] Pius Parsch, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 247.

[26] For discussion, see above, 74 n9.

connection between the two cannot be assumed. The earliest attestable form of the Roman canon is that in the Gelasian Sacramentary.[27]

Is there other evidence besides the questionable witness of *Traditio Apostolica* for a Spirit epiclesis in the Roman canon? Fortescue is certain that there was once such an epiclesis in the Roman rite:

> It is, I think, certain that the Roman rite too once had an Epiklesis of the Holy Ghost. Apart from the fact that otherwise it would be unique in Christendom, we have direct evidence of it. Pope Gelasius I (492-496) refers to it twice. The first reference is perhaps less certain; he says that the bread and wine 'change into the divine substance, the Holy Ghost working this.' But the second leaves surely no doubt that Gelasius knew the Epiklesis: 'How shall the heavenly Spirit, being invoked, come to the consecration of the divine mystery, if the priest who prays him to be present is condemned as being full of evil deeds?' We may then surely conclude that in the Vth century Rome had an invocation of the Holy Ghost.[28]

He further suspects that the epiclesis was not simply lost but

> …was removed at Rome, apparently deliberately, because of the growing Western insistence on the words of institution as the Consecration form. A long series of Latin Fathers insist upon this…As soon as people began to ask what exactly the 'form' of the Sacrament they answered, at any rate in the West, that it is the words of Christ which 'operate what they state,' as theologians put it. So, a later prayer for consecration seemed unnecessary and misleading. Of the time when the Invocation was removed we can only surmise that it was between Gelasius I (Vth cent.) and the Gelasian Sacramentary (VIth or VIIth cent). It is often suggested that this may be one the changes made by St Gregory I (590-604).[29]

Both of Fortescue's suggestions suffer from serious difficulties. He admits that the first quotation from Gelasius is not certain, and there is an equal lack of certitude on the second quotation despite his assurances to the contrary. This second quote does not prove there is or was an individual petition of the Holy Spirit in the Roman rite, since it is saying little more than the first quotation about the role of the Spirit. Rather, it is

---

[27]Specifically, *Codex Reginensis 316*, which is the oldest copy of the Gelasian Sacramentary. This manuscript is a pre-Carolingian romanisation, probably dating from about 750 at Paris, with the older Roman material no earlier than ca. 650. Among other specifically ancient Roman elemtns, it contains the oldest form of the Roman canon. See Frank C. Senn, *Christian Worship*, 177.

[28] Adrien Fortescue, *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy* (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1953), 405.

[29] Ibid., 405-6.

speculation that Gelasius refers to an individual invocation of the Holy Spirit as we typically think of the epiclesis, and it would seem speculation based on the assumption that such an epiclesis was there in the first place. Fortescue's subsequent suggestion that the Spirit epiclesis was removed can only be sustained if there was a Spirit epiclesis in the Roman canon to begin with. Building on the questionable speculation as to the meaning of Gelasius' comments regarding the role of the Holy Spirit in the liturgy, Fortescue concludes without sufficient support that this prayer *must* have been removed. However, since there is little reason to conclude that a Spirit epiclesis was there in the first place, the assumption that it was later removed must also be rejected.

Without much documentary evidence supporting the existence of a Spirit epiclesis in the Roman rite, we are left to wonder why no such epiclesis would have developed in the first place, and the answer for why the Roman rite has no Spirit epiclesis is the same as why there is one in the Byzantine rite: specifically the influence of the Pneumatomachi. The first reference to Pneumatomachi comes from the Letters of Athanasios to Sarapion (ca. 359/60).[30] The Pneumatomachi were not particularly active in the West, and indeed were primarily a concern only in the prefecture of Oriens,[31] although Niceta of Remesiana found them along the banks of the Danube in the fourth century, probably because Arian Goths were present in the area as well, and likely before the Council of Rome, 377 which explicitly condemned the Pneumatomachi.[32] Unlike the conflict with Arianism, the conflict over the nature of the Holy Spirit could not be settled by appeals to the scriptures or the liturgy because the role of the Spirit in both places was ambiguous. As a result, the liturgy developed among the orthodox so as to highlight the importance and divinity of the Spirit. Later Eastern Fathers, most notably Isidore of Pelusium (c. 440) were able to say the Spirit was divine precisely because of the consecratory action assigned to the Spirit in the liturgy.[33] Remembering the rationale for inserting the Spirit epiclesis into the Eastern liturgies, it may be safely concluded that the Roman canon does not have an epiclesis not because it was edited out because of

---

[30] Cf. Richard P. C. Hanson, *Search for the Christian Doctrine of God The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 760ff., 809.
[31] Ibid., 809.
[32] Cf. Andrew E. Burn (ed.), *Niceta of Remesiana: His Life and Works* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1905), pp. lxvii, ff.
[33] Kilmartin, 'The Active Role of Christ and the Spirit' *Diakonia* 17.2 (1982) 98. See also Reginald Woolley, *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 96, 111.

medieval Eucharistic theology and the subsequent emphasis on the verba as consecratory simply because the Roman canon never possessed a Spirit epiclesis in the first place!

While none of the above conclusively proves that there is an epiclesis in the Roman canon, it demonstrates that the type of epiclesis found in the Byzantine rite was never there. This easily leads to the conclusion that there is nothing within the Roman rite which can be properly called an epiclesis. On the other hand, it is important to recall that in antiquity that there were various types of epiclesis, both in terms of addressee and in terms of petition. If we are looking for an epicletic form in the Roman canon, there are at least a few choices to consider within the text: *supplices te rogamus*, the second petition after the *verba*; *veni sanctificator*, which comes at the conclusion of the offertory rite; and *quam oblationem*, which right before the *verba* in the canon.

Supplices is identified as the best possibility for a Roman epiclesis, at least by Orthodox and Eastern Catholic commentators,[34] and with good reason because of both the prayer's similarity to the epiclesis in the Byzantine rite in asking for the 'fruits of communion' and because the Byzantine epiclesis and *supplices* fall in the same relative location in the two rites. If this is indeed an epiclesis, it is certainly different from the type known to the Byzantine rites. In the first place, there is no direct mention of the Holy Spirit; here instead, the text speaks of a 'Holy Angel'.[35] Secondly, there is no call for the one invoked (in this case, an angel) to descend upon the gifts but here the text speaks of the angel carrying the sacrifice up to the heavenly altar. Finally, there is no petition for the elements of communion to become or to be shown as the body and blood of Christ, though there is the request that those gathered will be able to participate in the Eucharist in a worthy manner.

The key to interpreting *supplices*, and consequently to understanding the prayer as epiclesis, is in understanding the identity of the 'angel' in the prayer. Reference to angels generally in the prayer of the church and more specifically in conjunction with the church's understanding of the eucharist should not be surprising. John Chrysostom

[34] Such as Nicholas Cabasilas, to whom we will return later. For more recent examples, see Woolfenden, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 163-92; Steven Coombs *The Eucharistic Prayer in the Orthodox West: A Reappraisal of its Ancient and Modern History, Peculiarities, and Possibilities* (Oxford: The Gregorian Club, 1987), 19-20; and Taft in a series of articles on the subject, but most notably, 'The Epiclesis Question' in Nassif (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, 214.

[35] Although see Ambrose, *De Sacramentis* (IV.27, *PL* 16, 445) where he states that it is 'holy angels.'

mentions that angels participate with the priest in the Eucharist,[36] as do Ambrose of Milan[37] and Gregory the Great.[38] The angel has been variously identified as one specially commissioned by God for the task of carrying the Eucharist, a guardian angel (either of the priest or of the specific church), or more specifically as the Archangel Michael.[39] Many commentators identify the 'Holy Angel' with the Logos, including Taft[40] and de la Taille.[41] If this interpretation could be sustained, then we could understand the epiclesis here as a primitive Logos epiclesis, which would only enhance the significance of the prayer by indicating its antiquity. Indeed, if the Logos were understood as the angel of sacrifice, it could be an echo of the angel Christology that was current in the second century.[42] Furthermore, we would be able to identify *supplices* as a communion Logos type epiclesis. This identification, at the very least, would also indicate a superficial similarity with the epiclesis we see in *Sarapion*.

In addition to identifying the Holy Angel as the Logos, Gassner points out that there are reasons to interpret *supplices* as referring to the Holy Spirit. This is also Fortescue's view, though he identifies *supplices* as the 'hacked off stump' of a fuller consecratory Spirit epiclesis.[43] Though there is no reference to the Spirit as an 'angel' in the scriptures, *Missale Gothicum* invokes the Spirit with 'infuse from above Thy Spirit, the Holy Paraclete, the angel of truth' in blessing the baptismal font.[44] Parsch also assumes that the angel is the Holy Spirit, in part because of the request for a fruitful communion, which constitutes the second half of the epiclesis in the Byzantine rite.[45] Gassner rejects both of the latter interpretations of *supplices* as being contrary to the structure of the canon: the 'angel' cannot be the Logos since the Son is mentioned in *per*

---

[36] '[At the invocation of the Spirit] angels attend the priest, and the space around the altar, the whole sanctuary, is filled with the heavenly powers who honour him who lies upon it' (John Chrysostom, *De Sacredotio* VI.4, *PG* 48, 681).
[37] Ambrose of Milan, *In Luc* I.28, *PL* 15, 1545.
[38] Gregory the Great, *Dialogs* IV.58, *PL* 77, 425.
[39] Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, 698-9.
[40] See Taft, 'From Logos to Spirit', *Gratis Agamus*, 231-2.
[41] Cf. Maurice de la Taille, *The Mystery of Faith, Book II* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1950),168-9, though here in the context of arguing for the antiquity of *supplices* because of a Logos-type epiclesis.
[42] Cf, e.g., Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), Loren Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), and Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1964).
[43] Fortescue, *The Mass*, 405-7.
[44] Gassner, *The Canon of the Mass*, 360-1.
[45] Parsch, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 247.

quem which immediately follows *supplices*, though he does indicate that the prayer could be understood as directed towards Christ since 'there is no consecration without Christ, every prayer and petition for consecration necessarily has the connotation of the causality of Christ.'[46] However, he does not specify a reason for rejecting the interpretation that the angel is the Holy Spirit, preferring simply to drop the matter entirely. Stephen Coombs is entirely convinced that the angel is synonymous with the Holy Spirit and, while admitting that the angel could be understood as the Logos, 'the latter option seems to conflict with the picture of Christ as the president of the heavenly liturgy, [while] the former is in itself less incongruous.'[47] Gihr is more specific in rejecting the interpretation that the angel is the Holy Spirit since doing so would make the prayer 'a real Epiklesis…But as this interpretation does violence to the text and brings into the Roman Canon of the Mass an almost insoluble difficulty (that is, the Epiklesis) of the Greek and Oriental liturgies without sufficient reason…we must reject it as untenable.'[48] Gihr's rejection of the *supplices* as an epiclesis may arise from an assumption that the *verba* alone are consecratory, though we are left to wonder how exclusively emphasizing the consecratory nature of the *verba* does any less violence to the interpretation of the canon.

Therefore, it seems most likely that the original sense of *supplices* was as a communion Logos epiclesis since the understanding of 'angel' as the Holy Spirit, while not impossible, is not as direct as considering the Logos as the angel in question. On the other hand, *supplices* is not the only text in the canon which can be understood as an epiclesis. Parsch and Gihr both identify *veni sanctificator* as the epiclesis in the Roman rite.[49] Johannes Emminghaus concurs, though he notes that such a prayer, set as it is at the preparation of the gifts rather than in the canon, is 'lodged in a most inappropriate

---

[46] Gassner, *The Canon of the Mass*, 361-2.

[47] Coombs, *The Eucharistic Prayer in the Orthodox West*, 20-1. Coombs, like most Orthodox writers who see *supplices* as an epiclesis, is inclined naturally to conclude that the angel is the Spirit because that is what one would otherwise expect from the Byzantine rite liturgies. On the other hand, dismissing the Logos interpretation as conflicting with Christ's unseen presidency is odd at best. Indeed, who better to bring the offerings of the Church into the presence of the Father for the benefit of the communicants than the one who is at once the offerer and the one offered? Interpreting the angel as the Spirit may be preferable in order to draw a stark line of connexion between the Roman rite and the Byzantine rite, but that does not mean the Logos interpretation is thereby deficient from the perspective of Orthodox theology or incorrect based on the internal logic of the Roman canon itself. Taking that into consideration, Coombs' logic is most certainly mistaken.

[48] Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, 699-700, n.50.

[49] Cf. Parsch, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 189-90 and Gihr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, 569-72.

place'.[50] But of all the interpretations, this seems to be the most problematic. In the first place, it does not fit the normal understanding of a Spirit type of epiclesis as the text petitions the 'sanctifier' to come. While Parsch, Gihr, and Emminghaus are correct that the sanctifier is the Holy Spirit, it is important to remember that the typical Spirit epiclesis petitions the Father to send the Spirit, and not for the Spirit to come directly. In the second place, such a positioning would be unique to the Roman rite and would require an understanding of the anaphora which would include the offertory. Finally, and this is a minor but very important point, the verb *benedic* (bless) has a distinct meaning from *immutans* (change),[51] which we might otherwise expect at this point were the text intended as a misplaced consecratory Spirit epiclesis.

One potential solution which has not been considered is that the epiclesis is broken up over the whole structure of the canon. Kilmartin suggests that the epiclesis in the Roman canon should be understood as interrupting the anamnesis, which would conclude with the *verba* and consequently be followed with a prayer over the communicants in the form of a communion epiclesis.[52] Such a structure is still at variance with the Byzantine anaphoras where the epiclesis caps the anamnesis. If this were the case, it would by no means be unique to the Roman rite, as Alexandrian Mark has the same feature. If the Roman rite is suspected of having a double epiclesis, with one part before the *verba*, the most logical choice would be *quam oblationem*. In some sense, the petition has some attractiveness since it asks God to do several things to the elements, including consecrate (*adscriptam*), though utilizing a variety of Roman legal terms at the same time. Parsch, while denying the value of *quam oblationem* as a potential portion of the epiclesis does acknowledge its place as a prayer for consecration of the elements, though noting it does not explicitly mention the Holy Spirit.[53] Simultaneously, while the petition does invoke God to make a change to the elements, there is no petition for the Father to send either the Logos or the Spirit to effect the change. While Kilmartin draws

[50] Johannes H. Emminghaus, *The Eucharist: Essence, Form, Celebration* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 183.
[51] Erasmus, in his translation of CHR, translates μεταβαλών as *immutans*; see John Chrysostom, *Ordo Divini sacrificii sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi*, *PG* 63, 916.
[52] Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West*, 369.
[53] Parsch, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 247.

parallels with Alexandrian Mark,[54] the latter does explicitly mention the arrival of the Spirit in both parts of the epiclesis, both before ('Fill, O God, this sacrifice also with the blessing which comes from you through your Holy Spirit…') and after the *verba* ('And we pray and beseech you, send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts which appear before our eyes, upon this bread and upon this cup, and may He make this bread the body of Jesus Christ and this cup the blood of the new covenant of our Lord and God, our Saviour and Supreme King Jesus Christ'[55]). The crucial element to make *quam oblationem* an epiclesis of any type would be *supplices*, and as we have seen, there are reasons that *supplices* is able to stand on its own as an epicletic text.

Therefore, while the Roman rite does have an epiclesis, though certainly not the developed consecration Spirit type, there is still the common assumption that an epiclesis must be inserted into the canon to make the rite Orthodox, and in every version of GRE, such an insertion, or 'strengthening' as it is usually referenced, has taken place. The epiclesis chosen for GRE has universally been taken from CHR: 'And we beseech thee, O Lord, to send down thy Holy Spirit upon these offerings, that he would make this bread the previous body of thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit.' This text is provided immediately before *supplices*, both in Overbeck's rite and in subsequent editions. But Overbeck shows some ignorance of the Byzantine rite at this point, since the epiclesis actually goes on to state, '…so that they may be to those who partake of them for vigilance of soul, forgiveness of sins, communion of Your Holy Spirit, fulfilment of the kingdom of heaven, confidence before You, and not in judgment or condemnation.' Why would Overbeck have omitted such a significant portion of the epiclesis? The answer lies not in the text, but in the rubrics and notes of his liturgy.

At the conclusion of the epiclesis, Overbeck directs the priest to genuflect, a gesture employed in the Roman rite to show reverence to the consecrated sacrament. The Roman canon has this rubric as well, though the rubric places one genuflection at the end of each clause of the *verba* ('this is my body,' 'this is my blood'). In commenting on

[54] Kilmartin *The Eucharist in the West*, 369; see also Richard Albertine, 'The Problem of the (Double) Epiclesis in the New Roman Eucharistic Prayers' (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1972).
[55] Bridget Nichols and Alistair MacGregor, *The Eucharistic Epiclesis* (Durham: Ushaw College Library, 2001), 8.

Overbeck's rubric, Thomann claims that Overbeck was 'a Roman Catholic in Eastern disguise when he transferred genuflection from the words of institution to the interloped epiclesis….This is rather a proof that Overbeck did not understand the Eastern view of the mystery.'[56] Most likely, Thomann is here referring to the Nicene prohibition against kneeling on Sundays and during the season of Easter.[57] L'Huillier notes that while canon §20 has not been abrogated, it is still violated by laity and clergy in the modern period, and we cannot assume he means Western rite clergy and laity alone.[58] Genuflection, specifically at the epiclesis, would have been a common sight in Russian churches of Overbeck's day.[59] However, Thomann's position may be correct if taken in the sense that Overbeck's epiclesis (and all subsequent 'strong' epiclesis in Western Rite Orthodoxy) express a theological minimalism when it comes to the role of the Holy Spirit, that is to say, that the primary role of the Spirit in the liturgy is to make the elements the body and blood of Christ and not to make the communicants holy as well.

Turning attention to TIK, we can see that there has been relatively light editorial work on 1928 American *BCP* to produce the current rite at this point. Indeed, an invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements of the Eucharist has always been a part of the *BCP* in one form or another. However, that does not distract Smith criticising TIK by claiming 'The commission also had harsh words concerning the epiclesis of the 1892 *BCP*.'[60] However, one would be hard-pressed to find any such 'harsh words'. While the first section does address the epiclesis, it is only in an offhanded way. That is to say, the focus is placed upon the importance of emphasizing the real change of the gifts into the body and blood of Christ. What is deficient is not the invocation of the Holy Spirit per se (which is the essential focus of the epiclesis in any case) to change the gifts, but rather the vagueness concerning what exactly it is the gifts are changed into, whether the real body and blood of Christ or a spiritual alteration only. TIK has been modified to address the

---

[56] Thomann, *The Western Rite in Orthodoxy*, 9-10.
[57] Canon §20, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 16.
[58] Peter L'Hullier, *The Church of the Ancient Councils*, 84.
[59] This, of course, despite numerous canons (e.g., Nicaea §20, Penthekte §90) and Nikodemos the Hagiorite insisting that kneeling on Sunday simply should not be done. Ioannis Fountoulis *Leitourgiki A*, 239-40, states that kneeling entered the Russian tradition during the Western-oriented reforms of Peter the Great in the eighteenth century and was subsequently imported into Greek practice by Queen Olga and its insertion into the typikon of the Greek Palace.
[60] Smith, 'Review Essay: *Saint Andrews Service Book*' *SVTQ* 41.2-3 (1997), 254.

demands made in the *RO* by inserting the phrase 'that they may be changed into the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.' In that regard, Smith's critique is misplaced.

What questionable is why the editors of TIK felt it was necessary to change the epiclesis from 'vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit' to 'vouchsafe to send down Thy Holy Spirit'. The former is certainly a legitimate portion of the traditional Anglican liturgy, having first been a part of the 1549 *BCP*, although in a different position.[61] In its present form and position, it has been a part of the American *BCP* since the first edition in 1790.[62] Certainly, it should be an acceptable prayer since it is derived, in part, from BAS.[63] Perhaps it was thought that 'word' as used in the original was a reference to the dominical words, or the *verba*, and as such to retain invocation of 'thy word' would have been contrary to Orthodox teaching. On the other hand, Shepherd[64] and Parsons and Jones[65] both describe 'Word' as a reference to the Logos and not to the *verba*.

But is adding an epiclesis to the Roman rite or the *BCP* necessary to bring it into conformity with Orthodox theology? Woolfenden certainly did not think so, and his conclusions are supported by a certain amount of historic legitimacy, especially when considering the statements of Nicholas Cabasilas:

> …the Latin Church herself, to whom they refer themselves, does not cease to pray for the offerings after the words of consecration have been pronounced. This point has escaped them, no doubt, because the Latins do not recite this prayer immediately after pronouncing Christ's words, and because they do not ask explicitly for consecration and transformation of the elements….it is clear that the Latins know perfectly well that the bread and wine are not yet consecrated [after the words of institution]; that is why they pray for the offerings as elements still in need of prayer. They pray that these which are still here below may be carried on high…. This prayer can only have one significance – it transforms the offerings into the Body and Blood of the Lord.[66]

---

[61] Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayerbook* (New York: Seabury Press, 1980), 369-70. The position of the epiclesis in the 1928 American Book of Common Prayer was derived from the 1764 Scottish rite of the Non-Jurors and is thanks, in part, to the work of Thomas Rattray who was familiar with the JAS, Cyril of Jerusalem's *Mysticagoical Catechesis*, and St Basil.
[62] Massey H. Shepherd, *Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*, 81.
[63] Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayerbook*, 310.
[64] Shepherd, *Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*, 81.
[65] Parsons and Jones, *The American Prayerbook*, 209, n.8.
[66] Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, Trans. J. M. Hussy and P. A. McNulty (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), 76-7. However, the reader should remember that Cabasilas, following Pseudo-Dionysius, goes on to state that the altar (identified with Christ himself) is

It should also be remembered that Cabasilas is writing well after the 1204 sack of Constantinople, which is sometimes given as the real date for the consummation of the Great Schism between East and West.[67] As it relates to the *BCP*, the answer is almost certainly no, that the additional epiclesis would be an unnecessary embolism, either necessitating the removal of the epiclesis that is already in place or having two prayers asking for the same thing sequentially, thus creating yet another anomalous situation for the Orthodox Western liturgies when compared to other historic rites in Christianity. Perhaps more problematic is the identification of the anamnesis in TIK as the 'consecration' in the *SASB*, but this may be evidence of editorial ineptitude or latent confusion about Orthodox theology to this point, despite changing the existing epiclesis in the *BCP* to the present form in TIK.

Putting the same question to GRE is a bit more difficult. We have already noted how the epiclesis seems came into the liturgy not by request of the Russian Synod but through the personal initiative of Overbeck and that subsequently it is regarded as an essential element of the Orthodox Western rite.[68] The problem of the epiclesis as framed here is one of historical fidelity on principal, but in truth the problem is larger than just the Western rite. As John McKenna notes,

> It is not in the details of these historical reconstructions, however, that their significance…lies. It is rather in the fact that, despite their differences, these reconstructions and others…agree that the doctrinal development of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist lead to the Spirit epiclesis and/or the tension between East and West over the Spirit epiclesis. This is an important insight because it underlines the fact that

---

what sanctifies the elements. It is his understanding that *supplices* is intended to consecrate the elements because no transference of place occurs because of the prayer.

[67] A point which Woolfenden also makes in his citation of Cabasilas; cf. Woolfenden 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 184.

[68] See Overbeck, 'The Western Uniate Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 1 (1867), 196, where Overbeck describes the changes which were necessary to make the canon Orthodox. Here he does mention an epiclesis in connection with the consecration of the elements, though he does not seem to mention inserting an epiclesis. It is possible that Overbeck considered *supra quae propitio* to be a type of epiclesis , though one 'rather mutilated' as he describes it, which is why he sought to replace it with an element from the Mozarabic liturgy. As Overbeck's ideas about the liturgy and his understanding of Orthodoxy were constantly evolving, it is not unreasonable to conclude that he subsequently became convinced that there was no epiclesis in the Roman rite and that one would have to be imported, though his Russian Orthodox supporters probably are the reason the epiclesis from CHR was chosen specifically. However, Overbeck is certainly the source of the interpolation of the epiclesis into the Roman rite even if his thinking was initially different as to what was the primitive remnant of that text in the Roman rite and where the fuller form should be derived from.

> any attempt to work out a theology of the epiclesis will have to face the apparent tension between the role of the Holy Spirit and the role of Christ in the Eucharist.[69]

Truthfully, the West has become more cognizant of the liturgical importance of emphasizing the role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic rite since Vatican II. This is perhaps nowhere better demonstrated than in the 2006 decision of the Holy See to authorize the celebration of Addai and Mari without the later inclusion of the *verba* but with the use of an explicit consecratory Spirit epiclesis.[70] From the Orthodox side, the 1982 statement of the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church concludes that 'The Spirit transforms the sacred gifts into the body and blood of Christ (metabolê) in order to bring about growth of the body which is the Church. In this sense, the entire celebration is an epiclesis, which becomes more explicit at certain moments'[71] with the North American Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation responded to the same document by saying the 1982 comments regarding the epiclesis were 'particularly welcome'.[72] Thus, as a greater sense of perspective on the question seems to be arising at the church and international level between East and West (in the form of the Roman Catholic Church), Western Rite Orthodoxy is stuck in somewhat of an awkward place.

The ecumenical statements mentioned above at the very least permit both churches to recognize the integrity of each other's rites without necessarily having to abjure their own eucharistic theology. At least in the abstract, this would make the necessity of adding an epiclesis to the Roman rite unnecessary. As a point of principle, one would not expect a Byzantine epiclesis to be put into the Roman canon, either because it is sufficient on its own merit or at the very least because a suitable Western

---

[69] McKenna, *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit*, 106.

[70] Although this was not without controversy. See, Taft, 'Mass without Consecration?', *Worship* 77.6 (2003) 482-509. Additionally evidence would include the explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit to consecrate the Eucharistic elements in Eucharistic Prayers II-IV of the Roman rite. This latter point underscores a significant irony for Western Rite Orthodoxy since many of the parishes that now constitute the AWRV abandoned their former communions as a result of liturgical changes taking place as a result of Vatican II.

[71] Joint International Commission, 'The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity' §I.5.c. in John Borelli and John H. Erickson (eds.), *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press), 55.

[72] U.S. Theological Consultation, 'A Response to the Joint International Commission', §5 in Borelli and Erickson (eds.), *The Quest for Unity*, 66.

alternative could be found. As Taft points out, 'A lot of these things happened in both East and West around the same time for the same reasons. So, it's not necessarily a question that somebody first put [a prayer] in and then everybody said, "hey, that's a great idea; let's do the same thing." No! You see things happening around the same time and for probably similar reasons.'[73] Simply put, just because something may be 'missing' from the Western Rite that is present in the Byzantine rite is insufficient reason to augment the supposedly deficient rite:

> One cannot just introduce into a particular liturgy whatever one sees in another tradition that looks good without taking into account the integral structure and genius of each rite. And vice-versa, the fact that one rite does not have this or that ritual...does not mean another rite can drop it.[74]

In responding to Woolfenden, Schneirla concludes that there have been 'some misunderstandings' in Woolfenden's grasp of the Western rite liturgies.[75] Schnerlia seems to suggest, based on a reference to Nicholas Uspensky,[76] that the epiclesis as it has developed in the Western rite is legitimate. There is at least the implication that the Church has the right to make such changes as it sees fit, but in light of Taft's statement above on the nature of liturgy, the critique holds less value: adding something to a rite for the sake of presumed expediency or to suit an ecclesiological preconception without consideration of its own inherent structure—in this case, the ascending nature of *supplices* if we identify it as a Logos epiclesis—is damaging to the rite. But Schnerlia does not state Uspensky's views on the ascending and descending epiclesis, or provide more than a vague reference, so we are left to wonder how Uspensky's work can be used to justify Schnerlia's position.[77] In addition, it actually does damage to the rite itself, as is suggested by Geoffrey Willis,

---

[73] Taft, *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It* (Berkely: InterOrthodox Press, 2006), 74.
[74] Taft, 'The Liturgy in the Life of the Church', *Logos*, 40.1-4 (1999) 196.
[75] Schneirla, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 193-97.
[76] '[Woolfenden] seems unaware of Uspensky's essay on the descending and ascending epiclesis' (Schneirla, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 196). For his part, Schneirla does not provide a reference to the essay he has in mind. It is possible he refers to a series by Nicholas Uspensky in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* and subsequently reprinted in English in *Orthodoxy* 9.4 (1962) 113-25, and *Orthodoxy* 9.5 (1962) 142-50.
[77] For that matter, while Schnerlia faults Woolfenden for not having taken Uspensky comments on the simultaneous use of an ascending and descending epiclesis, Uspensky himself only displays a rudimentary knowledge of the Western liturgy, if the article referenced in n77 above is the article in question. On the

> the notion of asking God to accept the oblation at the heavenly alter and to send down in return the Holy Spirit upon the gifts…is, in fact, illogical and inconsistent; for if the gifts have in response to the Church's petition, been taken up to the heavenly altar, they no longer remain upon the earthly alter for the Holy Spirit to be sent down upon them to consecrate them.[78]

While accepting that Willis is speaking of adding a descending epiclesis after *supplices* and GRE has added it before, his point is still salient: if the gifts upon the altar have been sanctified by the Holy Spirit, what need is there to take them to the heavenly altar to be sanctified?

Historically, there really should be no reason to question the validity of the Roman canon except as a means of overcompensating for Scholastic sacramental theology. Certainly, there are a sufficient number of classical commentators who felt that the Roman canon and its epiclesis were perfectly valid as they stood, Nicholas Cabasilas not the least among them. Returning to the ecumenical question again briefly, we must briefly consider what adding a Byzantine epiclesis to the Roman canon says concerning the acceptability of the rite in the first place. Taft states that

> Both Latin and Greek liturgical expressions of the eucharistic prayer of blessing over the bread and wine, and the implicit theologies they unselfconsciously expressed, coexisted peacefully for centuries not only in the undivided Church. They were also explicitly formulated in the theologies of saints like Ambrose and John Damascene, still revered as saints and Fathers of the Church by both East and West. This means, I would think, that each Church must accept both expressions as legitimate, or render their pretense to orthodoxy questionable for having remained in communion for well over a millennium with a Church, and for continuing even today to venerate in their liturgical calendar, its saints, that held, celebrated, and professed heretical views on so fundamental an issue as the eucharist.[79]

Taft puts it more bluntly when he states that 'on the basis of facts, neither Latins nor Greeks can sustain, without being simply ridiculous in the face of their own history, a

---

other hand, Uspensky's comments actually express agreement with Woolfenden in condemning this hybridized epiclesis which has been ubiquitous in Western Rite Orthodoxy from the start.

[78] Geoffrey G. Willis, 'God's Altar on High', *The Downside Review* 90.301 (1972) 250.

[79] Taft, 'Ecumenical Scholarship and the Catholic-Orthodox Epiclesis Dispute', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 45.3-4 (1996) 218.

position that their view is the only legitimate one.'[80] However, if a consecratory Spirit type epiclesis is nonetheless felt to be a necessity, one is left to wonder why it ought to be taken from CHR since there are other Western liturgies which have a requisite epiclesis, and it seems more reasonable to take the text from one of those rites. If a specifically consecratory epiclesis is not necessary but a text which emphasizes the role of the Spirit in the eucharist is, perhaps it would have been better to use the text from *Traditio Apostolica* 4.12 which Parsch and others look to as the 'original' epiclesis: 'And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit in the oblation of [your] holy church [that] gathering [them] into one you will give to all who partake of the holy things [to partake] in the fullness of the Holy Spirit, for the strengthening of faith in truth…'[81] Despite its problems, this would have been somewhat preferable to the solution that actually was implemented by Overbeck.[82]

---

[80] Taft, 'The Epiclesis Question' in Nassif (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Theology*, 225. It should at least be mentioned that any other conclusion would be difficult for Taft to make, since he is an Eastern Catholic priest. That aside, his perspective in this case (that the ancient Roman liturgical tradition was considered equally legitimate with the Byzantine liturgical tradition) roughly approximates Western Rite Orthodox justifications for their use of the Western Rite, though it seems obvious to this author that Taft would wholly disagree with their decision to interpolate the CHR epiclesis rather than being faithful to their own liturgical heritage. In that regard, while Taft's comment may not be entirely bias-free, this author is confident that it is correct under present circumstances.

[81] Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips (eds.), *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary* (Minnenapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 40. However, even this suggestion is not without its own difficulties as, in addition to the question of whether or not *The Apostolic Tradition* represents a primitive form of the Roman rite, there are questions whether the epiclesis as received is the original. More details can be found in the above, 33 ff., but to summarize briefly, Dix was convinced that the received Latin translation was a late interpolation while the more 'primitive' sounding epiclesis of *Testamentum Domini* was probably closer to the original text (*Apostolic Tradition*, 14 n.4). Cyril C. Richardson argued the present Latin was corrupted to the present version ('The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus', Harvard Theological Review 40.2 (1947) 101-8) while Bernard Botte concluded that the original text included an epiclesis on the elements ('Le'épiclèse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947) 241-51 and 'À propos de la "Tradition apostolique"', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33 (1966) 183). Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 170-7, believed there had never been an epiclesis in the original version of *Testamentum Domini* or *The Apostolic Tradition* in the first place, so there was no need to furnish a reconstruction in any case. For their part, Bradshaw and his co-authors point to recent work on the historical development of the epiclesis in general which demonstrate that earlier epicletic formula were in the imperative (e.g., 'come') and later formulas request sending of the Logos or Spirit, thus indicating that the epiclesis in *The Apostolic Tradition* is likely not original, the question of dating aside.

[82] While Overbeck may not have been familiar with *The Apostolic Tradition*, though it was widely published in England since the 17th century, but he was familiar with other Western liturgies, including the Mozarabic rite. Later editors of the Western rite liturgies, including Alexander Schmemann, probably were familiar with the Hippolytus text and could certainly have made use thereof.

Granted, Overbeck was not a theologian and was hardly a liturgist, but he was a polemicist and was interested in preserving the celebration of the Roman rite as close as could be deemed possible without impinging on Orthodoxy. Overbeck did keep the genuflections after the consecration of the elements, though with his knowledge of Orthodoxy there is little way he could have kept them after the *verba* as they are in the Tridentine rite. It is quite possible that Overbeck was not aware of the significance of *supplices* and so felt it expedient to add something to the rite which was definitively an epiclesis, the most obvious choice being that from CHR since it would have been familiar to the Russian Church from whom he was attempting to gain acceptance. Such an addition ultimately reflects Overbeck's partial understanding of both the Roman and Byzantine rites and his shifting of scholastic presuppositions about the eucharist from one part of the text (the *verba*) to another.

Ultimately, we must conclude that while it is certainly desirable to emphasize the role of the Holy Spirit as consecrator in the liturgy and downplay the Scholastic emphasis on a 'moment' of consecration, the choices made by Western Rite Orthodox at this point are not the proper path, either from the perspective of Orthodox theology or from the perspective of fidelity to the Western liturgical tradition.

The 'Moment of Consecration' and Eucharistic Adoration

The second problem for consideration is likewise concerned with the consecration of the Eucharist. Like the problem of the epiclesis, it is a latent holdover from the Scholastic era and speculation on the 'moment of consecration' in the Eucharistic rite, that of liturgical cues surrounding the *verba* to alert the faithful of the eucharistic consecration so that they might venerate the sacrament as soon as it became the body and blood of Christ. Aside from Scholastic theology, one other important factor gave force to the new forms of eucharistic piety: the decreasing frequency of communion among the laity.[83] This was not a new problem for Christianity, nor was it one confined solely to the West: John Chrysostom laments the faithful who come to church for the great sermons and then leave with the catechumens so that they do not receive communion. By the

[83] Cf. Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1982), 72-3.

Fourth Lateran Council (1215), the faithful were required to receive communion at least once every year or face excommunication.

There are two points in the canon where the gifts are held aloft. The first elevation takes place during the *verba*, where each the element is raised individually as it is mentioned and is sometimes referred to as the great elevation. In the second, or minor, elevation, the priest holds the host over the chalice and then lifts both together to eye level during the concluding doxology of the canon ('By him, with him, in him…'). The principal elevation entered the rite during the thirteenth century, while the minor elevation at the doxology was considerably more ancient and is probably related to the historic showing of the elements to the faithful before communion began. The Byzantine rite has an elevation similar to the minor elevation in the Roman Rite when the priest declares 'Your own of your own' during the anaphora while raising the chalice and the lamb on the diskos.[84]

Historically, as participation in communion by the laity decreased in frequency, there arose a need for the faithful to find an expression of eucharistic piety by other means, and this was primarily accomplished by permitting the faithful to view the host immediately after it was consecrated, allowing them to participate visually in the eucharistic action since they would not be communicating. While it is known that the host was frequently held at chest or even eye level during the recitation of the *verba* prior to the thirteenth century, it gradually began to be held higher, and for a longer period of time, so that the faithful could view and adore the sacrament. While there was no attempt to eliminate the practice, there were several attempts to regulate it, primarily to ensure that the faithful did not venerate the sacrament before it had become the body and blood of Christ, and thus worship a created thing as the Divine Logos, and a number of councils and decrees from this time period require the priest to elevate the elements only after the *verba* are spoken over each of them.[85] To facilitate this viewing of the host by the

[84] The other elevation in the Byzantine rite is when the priest shows the lamb to the faithful at 'Holy things for the holy'; while not in the same place, the visual similarity between this elevation/showing of the consecrated elements and the great elevation of the host during the consecration is striking.

[85] Cf. Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* II, 206ff. The first such order comes from Paris in 1210, though the same rule spreads quickly, along with the actual practice itself. And, it should be pointed out, the elevation takes place after each element had been consecrated, not after both were consecrated. Peter Comestor and Peter Cantor both argue that the change takes place only after the words are spoken over both elements, this view is ultimately rejected *de jure* as independent syndoical legislation affects the actual

faithful, a number of practices were taken up to enhance visibility and the sense of liturgical drama: lighted candles were held next to the bread, dark curtains were drawn behind the altar so that the white host would stand out in starker relief and could be more easily seen from the rear of a church. Bells would be rung so that those faithful not in the church could pause to venerate the sacrament wherever they were, while those in church would be alerted that the consecration was taking place so that they could cease whatever devotions they were praying. In some places during a solemn mass, the host and chalice were incensed during the elevation.[86] It was also customary to pay priests larger mass stipends so that they would hold the host even higher allowing the faithful a better view of the Eucharistic bread.[87] Thomas Cranmer, not without bias, comments on the situation in his day:

> For else what made the people to run from their seats to the altar, and from altar to altar, and from sacring, as they called it, to sacring, peeping, tooting, and gazing at that thing which the priest held up in his hands, if they thought not to honour that thing which they saw? What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads? Or the people to cry to the priest, 'Hold up, hold up;' and one man to say to another, 'Stoop down before;' or to say, 'This day have I seen my Maker;' and 'I cannot be quiet 'except I see my Maker once a day?' What was the cause of all these, and that as well the priest and the people so devoutly did knock and kneel at every sight of the sacrament, but that they worshipped that visible thing which they saw with their eyes, and took it for very God?[88]

And such was the state of much medieval devotion in relation to the Eucharist. It is perhaps not a stretch to suggest that many Orthodox theologians would be as horrified as Cranmer over the state of activity surrounding the Eucharist, though for different reasons; certainly, theological treatises are full of condemnations for the Roman practice of venerating the sacrament. Nevertheless, this sort of behaviour, while not a direct result of development of the elevation, certainly was only enhanced by its creation.

The inclusion of the elevation in the Orthodox Western rite, particularly the greater elevation of the host, is problematic for two related reasons. The first it involves

---

practice of elevation along the lines that it is known today; cf. V. T. Kennedy 'The Moment of Consecration', *Medieval Studies* 6 (1944) 121-150.

[86] Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* II, 209.

[87] Ibid., 209.

[88] Thomas Cranmer, 'A Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament', IV, Chap. IX' in G. E. Duffield (ed.), *The Works of Thomas Cranmer* (Appleford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964), 210.

the doctrine of transubstantiation. It is claimed that the original rationale for raising the eucharist aloft during or immediately after the consecration was to deny the receptionist eucharistic doctrine Berengarius' *De Sacra Coena*,[89] where he denied that the host became the physical body of Christ during the liturgy. Berengarius' theology was a reaction to what might be described as the 'crude realism' of Paschasius Radbertus' *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*[90] where he attempts to explain the relationship between the eucharistic elements and the historic body of Christ, as well as precisely how Christ is really present in the sacrament, sometimes approaching a seemingly 'mystic cannibalism'.[91] Berengarius' recantation following his condemnation for heresy in 1059 included among the following affirmations that he believed 'that [the body and blood] are touched and broken by the hands of the priests and crushed by the teeth of the faithful' in a physical as well as sacramental manner.[92] Such a confession is a distinct departure from the classical eucharistic formulations of Christ's presence in the sacrament, particularly the Augustinian formulation which states the precise opposite of Berengarius' confession.[93] That is not to say that the fathers did not believe or teach that Christ is really present in the sacramental elements, that the bread and wine are not truly the body and blood of Christ, only that they did not attempt to define the presence in such materialistic terms, and certainly did not identify it with the historic body of Christ.[94] This shift, while not immediately affecting the liturgy, would ultimately have its effect in the devotional activity of the people participating in the liturgy. And while, as we have seen, there are practical reasons for why the practice of elevating the host came about, it is also true that these developments would not have taken place without the simultaneous developments in eucharistic theology, particularly the growing identification of the sacramental elements with the actual and historic body of Jesus Christ.[95]

---

[89] Berengarius of Tours, '*De Sacra Coena*' in Wilhelm H. Beekenkamp (ed.), *Berengarii Turonensis de sacra coena adversus Lanfrancum* (Le Haye, 1941).
[90] Paschasius Radbertus, '*De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*' in Beda Paulus (ed.), *Corpus Christianorum, continuation mediaevalis* 16 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1969).
[91] Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy*, 78-80.
[92] Ibid., 137.
[93] Ibid., 138.
[94] Ibid., 138.
[95] This latter development stems from Ratramnus' *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* (*PL* 121, 125-70) in the ninth century, which attempts to understand the relationship of the Eucharistic body of Christ to his physical, historical body; explain how Christ is really present in simultaneous celebrations of the

The second problem, as was briefly mentioned in the introduction, is the question over the 'moment of consecration'. We have already investigated this problem at length in relation to the epiclesis, but it is also a relevant problem when the elevation is considered. Fortescue claims that while the elevation is not 'a declaration of belief in consecration by the words of institution, though it seems to commit us to that belief.'[96] Certainly, this was the frame of mind in the thirteenth century, when synodal legislation demanded that priests keep the host hidden from sight of the people until after the words for the bread had been completed, lest they venerate a created thing as the very body of Christ. So, while Fortescue is uncertain as to whether or not the elevation makes a firm commitment to the *verba* as consecratory, there can be little doubt from an historic perspective that the elevation is a declaration of faith in the real presence and simultaneously that the dominical words are what make the sacrament. Certainly, such a theology of eucharistic consecration is contrary to Orthodox sacramental theology, and yet the expression of this contrary theology is nevertheless retained in the present Orthodox Western Rite, the ringing of bells included.

Perhaps the fuss over the elevation is itself unnecessary since those who are a part of the Western rite do not understand or utilize the elevation the same way as in the medieval West. But, there can be no doubt that the elevation was used specifically for the purpose of permitting the faithful to venerate the newly consecrated host, a practice which itself diverges very strongly from Orthodox sacramental understanding. Additionally, the retention of the ringing of bells does little to demonstrate an appropriate understanding of the nature of Eucharistic consecration. As has been pointed out, the ringing of bells at the consecration was instituted to draw the attention of the people so that they could observe the miracle of transubstantiation when it was taking place, since they could no longer hear or understand the Latin recitation of the *verba*. This action is

---

sacrament; and the difference between the elements before and after consecration. Prior treatises on the Eucharist had reiterated the Church's faith in the real presence without attempting to explain it systematically. Paschasius goes on to develop his eucharistic theology independent of the celebration of mass, allowing it to grow into what has been described as a 'mystical cannibalism.' Though he does not wholly embrace the sort of 'butcher shop' theology repudiated by St. Augustine and will be opposed for quite some time, most notably by Ratramnus, Paschasius begins a process of theological evolution that, at its height, will precisely embrace the butcher shop theology, as seen in the recantation of Berengarius in 1059. For further details on this process, see Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy*, 73-86 and 137-151.

[96] Fortescue, *The Mass*, 338-9.

one which specifically identifies the *verba* as the 'moment of consecration' and thus preserves the scholastic understanding of eucharistic consecration. The addition of bells to the epiclesis does little to change this sentiment, even if we identify the epiclesis as the point of consecration. The problem is not so much with the bells but with what they are intended to signify: the moment of consecration. From the perspective of primitive eucharistic theology, it would probably be more accurate to think of the entire canon as being 'consecratory.' Schmemann agrees with the idea that it is inappropriate to think of a 'moment' of consecration, even intimating that the entire liturgy is, in fact, consecratory.[97]

Related to the problem of the elevation of the elements during the liturgy is the veneration of the host outside the eucharistic rite in what is commonly known as the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in the West, or Veneration of the Blessed Sacrament in the Orthodox Western rite. We have already spoken of the connexion between the elevation and the introduction of the doctrine of transubstantiation, but a more significant problem is in the connexion to venerating the elements themselves outside the context of the eucharistic liturgy because of the difficulties it creates for the Western rite when considered in the light of Orthodox sacramental theology and the eucharistic practice of Eastern Christianity as related to the consecrated elements. Here again the changes in frequency of communion affected the forms of eucharistic piety, and Solemn Benediction arises from the same time period and is another example of these evolving pieties.

Reservation of the sacrament had been known in East and West from early times, primarily for taking communion to those absent from the common Sunday liturgy, whether due to sickness or imprisonment. Justin Martyr makes references to the practice,[98] as does Dionysius of Alexandria, specifically in regards to saving the eucharistic elements to provide to those in danger of death. Furthermore, it was not uncommon for hermits, or even lay men and women, to take a portion of the elements home after the Sunday liturgy, as St Basil acknowledges and approves.[99] As Christianity

[97] Schemann, *Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988), 13-4.
[98] Justin Martyr, *Apologia Prima* 65, *PG* 6, 427/8.
[99] Basil the Great, *Epist. XCIII*, *PG* 32 ,483/4-485/6.

became legal in the fourth century and more purpose-built churches began to appear, they also included a place to store items used in the celebration of the Eucharist and to reserve the sacrament itself. I nterest in the elements of communion as an object of devotion in their own right began to grow, as did a desire to pray before the sacrament, both during the liturgy (such as at the elevation) and at the place of reservation. Thus, we see the place of reservation moved from a sacristy out into the chancel, either with a sacrament house, a pyx suspended above the main altar, in purpose built niche or cupboard (an aumbry), or in a tabernacle placed directly on the altar by the sixteenth century.[100]

TOR contains Solemn Benediction in Latin and English, omitting any rubrics for blessing the faithful with the monstrance. It also omits the final hymn before Ps. 117 and changes the final line of the praises from *procedenti ab utroque* ('from [the Father and the Son] each eternally') to *procedenti ab illoque* ('from one with both is one') so as to remove reference to *filioque*.[101] The rite was not included in *TOM* but has been included in the *SASB*, in more or less the same form as in *TOR*, though only in English. The primary difference between the two versions is that the *SASB* reinstates the rubric that the priest is to bless the people with the host in the monstrance, and that it changes the title from 'Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament' to 'Veneration of the Blessed Sacrament'. Thus, we have the anomaly that the liturgy described as a 'benediction' contains no element of blessing while the liturgy of 'veneration' includes the blessing with monstrance as an integral part of the ceremony. In the introduction to the liturgy in the *SASB*, the editor adds justifies Solemn Benediction as '[parallel to] devotion to the icon in the East. Both devotions are based upon the same Incarnation theology and the same desire of the faithful to "come and see…"'.[102]

The argument relating devotion to the Blessed Sacrament to the cult of icons may be regarded as suspect, other rationale for retention of the Solemn Benediction are provided by Edward Hughes. He states that the veneration of the sacrament is both ancient and eastern in origin and that by extension it should not be a disputed matter if

[100] Cf. Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy*, 164ff.
[101] The altered text here is interesting since the suffix in *illoque* is unnecessary grammatically, but seems to be included for poetic purposes. The translation provided does not arise from text itself since the text can be rendered as 'to the one who procedes from him', in reference to the Father, so it would appear that the rather loose translation provided is designed to maintain the rhythm similar to the original English translation.
[102] Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 103.

Solemn Benediction is included among the liturgies of the Western rite. Thereafter, citing Dix, he states that eucharistic veneration arises first in Syria and then is imported to the West during the seventh century.[103] Hughes makes two assertions about the nature of the Veneration of the Sacrament which require a more in-depth approach: the history of devotions to the Blessed Sacrament in the West and the nature of those same devotions in the East. This in turn causes us to look back to Hughes' second claim, specifically that devotion to the Sacrament arose first in the East. Certainly, there can be little quarrel with his citations as evidence for such a claim, referencing primary literature of no less stature than St Cyril's *Mystagogical Catechesis*.[104] Certainly, by the time of Theodore of Mopsuestia, we begin to see what Taft refers to as '"personalization" of piety towards the Divine Presence of Christ in the consecrated gifts of his Sacred Body and Blood.'[105] In both instances, these Eastern fathers encourage Eucharistic adoration, the context is summed up by Taft: '…what is different about Eastern and Western Christian eucharistic adoration is not its presence or absence, but the fact that in the East it has remained where it was throughout pre-Medieval Christendom East and West: in the context of the eucharistic liturgy and not as something apart'[106] and 'For Eastern Christians' profound eucharistic devotion and adoration is clearly demonstrated in the devotional practices accompanying the *reception* of Holy Communion…'.[107] None of the Eastern Fathers mentioned by Hughes, or Taft for that matter, explicitly recommend visiting the sacrament in order to pray before it, but all of them do urge the faithful to show reverence for the Eucharistic elements in the proper cultic context, that is, during the liturgy.

None of the above is to suggest that the veneration of the Eucharist outside the context of actually receiving the Holy Gifts does not display a logical process of development; it does. Nor can one claim that there were numerous saints in the pre-schismatic East and West who visited the sacrament to pray before it: there were. Taft reminds us that St Gregory the Theologian was embarrassed that his sister visited the sacrament and had smeared it over her body to be cured of an illness (something no one,

---

[103] Edward Hughes, 'Para-liturgical Devotions' (M.Div. thesis, St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, 1980), 20; citing Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 523.
[104] Hughes, 'Para-liturgical Devotions', 20, citing Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis Mystagocicae* 5.21, *PG* 33, 1123/4-1125/6.
[105] Taft, 'Is There Devotion to the Holy Eucharist in the Christian East?', *Worship* 80.3 (2006) 218.
[106] Ibid., 221.
[107] Ibid., 222, emphasis mine.

East or West, Orthodox or Catholic would advocate presently) and was in fact healed.[108] James Monti also provides a venerable list of pre-Schism western saints who visited and prayed before the sacrament.[109] And, the title character of *A Pilgrim's Tale* delays his travels in order to venerate the sacrament as it is given to the dying.[110] However, the starting point for that development is the cultic act of eucharistic liturgy and not unique individual visits to the reserved sacrament. Even in *A Pilgrim's Tale*, the title character waits to venerate the sacrament as it is brought to a sick individual, rather than going to the church where the sacrament is kept, thus maintaining the authentic cultic connection between the eucharistic elements and their veneration, that is, in the context of receiving communion.

Just as devotion to the sacrament cannot be cut off from its original root in the veneration of the faithful before receiving the gifts, at the same time the more 'extreme' forms of the devotion which Hughes clearly intends to avoid are just as much a part of the history of devotion to the sacrament outside the context of the euchristic rite. One cannot simply shrug this off as 'ghastly' or 'abusive', as Hughes seeks to do. Rather, these devotional exercises are the result of natural development within the veneration of the Blessed Sacrament in a cultural context primarily excluded from the prevailing piety of the eucharistic liturgy, both by physical and linguistic distance and perceived unworthiness. Irwin uses eucharistic veneration as an example of why 'one needs to be careful in determining *a priori* what constituted 'liturgy' in the sense of what was experienced as "the work of the people" as opposed to what liturgical rituals said was the work of the people.'[111] Furthermore, much that Hughes condemns, while not directly antecedent to venerating the sacrament outside the eucharistic liturgy, does spring from the same desire to venerate the sacrament. He identifies several practices for censure, including enshrining the host in an altar with (or in place of) relics, burying the dead with the host, and enshrining the host in sepulchres for Good Friday and carrying them to the altar on Easter, among other customs.[112] Of course, it is these very same abuses that

[108] Ibid., 215.
[109] Benedict J. Groeschel and James Monti, *In the Presence of the Lord: The History, Theology, and Psychology of Eucharistic Devotion* (Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing, 1997), 188.
[110] Anon., *The Pilgrim's Tale*, Trans. T. Allen Smith (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 91
[111] Irwin, *Text and Context*, 61.
[112] Hughes, 'Paraliturgical Devotions', 22, 31-2.

Mitchell identifies as the direct antecedents to Solemn Benediction since these are the genesis of a Eucharistic cult cut off from Mass.[113]

The above speaks only to the veneration of the Eucharistic gifts which are at least somewhat acceptable to Orthodoxy theology and spirituality, if one considers the context. However, the veneration of the sacrament is not the entirety of the liturgy, but is rather only an element of it. The more common title for the rite, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, is more evocative of the second action of this rite, specifically the blessing of the faithful with the host. And here again, the priest making the sign of the cross over the faithful at the conclusion of the communion rite in the Byzantine liturgy can be understood as an example of an Eastern version of the same liturgical action as blessing the faithful with the monstrance. But the Eastern form for blessing being attached to the eucharistic liturgy and not as a thing apart. Consequently, this example suffers from many of the same deficiencies as the arguments for venerating the sacrament outside of the eucharistic liturgy. There is also the added difficulty that the blessing with the chalice is comparatively late (probably arising around the fifteenth century) and was probably added under Latin influence.[114]

Putting aside Hughes' arguments in favour of Solemn Benediction, the opinion expressed in the *SASB* that the rite is similar to the cult of icons in the East has not been adequately considered. At a superficial level, the comparison is somewhat reasonable since there is an unique affection for venerating the sacrament outside the eucharistic liturgy that is not present in the East. Simultaneously there is affection for the veneration of icons in the East that is not common in the West. But this comparison is not without its problems. Ouspensky views the equation of the sacrament with the icons of Christ is fundamentally a Protestant notion, being foreign to both Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism.[115] He states, 'Christ is not shown in the Holy Gifts, He is given. He is shown in the icons. The visible side of the reality of the Eucharist is an image which can never be replaced, either by imagination or by looking on the Holy Gifts.'[116] Ouspensky

[113] Cf. Mithcell, *Cult and Controversy*, 184-6.
[114] Casimir A. Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* (Allendale: Alleluia Press, 1971), 718-9.
[115] Leonide Ouspensky, 'The Problem of the Iconostasis', *SVSQ* 8.4 (1964) 214. See also Pavel Florensky *Iconostasis* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996) for a similar perspective.
[116] Ouspensky, 'The Problem of the Iconostasis', *SVSQ* 8.4 (1964), 214-15.

makes an important point about the lack of iconic significance to be attached to the Eucharistic elements: among reformed Protestants, including many Anglicans, the element are representative of a spiritual presence of Christ among his people, whereas Orthodox, Catholic and Lutherans would affirm that the elements are Christ really, truly present, though with varrying expressions of how that reality is manifest. It may be difficult to argue that the original groups of Anglicans who came into Western Rite Orthodoxy harboured memorialist or spiritualized sensibilities regarding the sacraments since many came from among Anglo-Catholic circles in many cases, but it is not unreasonable to consider the possibility.[117]

More troubling, the Seventh Ecumenical Council states that 'Neither the Lord nor His Apostles anywhere stated that the Bloodless Sacrifice offered by the priest is an icon or picture.'[118] And Theodore of Mopsuestia reminds us '[Christ] did not say "This is the symbol of my body" or "this is the symbol of my blood", but "this is my body and my blood"; this fact instructs us to see the nature of the thing, for when the words are pronounced over [the elements] they become his body and blood.'[119] But Hughes makes this very mistake in stating that 'the reverence paid to relics or icons reverts to the antitype [*sic*],'[120] despite having already said previously posited that the elements become the very body and blood of Christ in the liturgy. Thus, there is no type (Christ) for the veneration to revert to from the antitype (the elements), so the rationale for including Solemn Benediction on this premise is suspect as well.

Finally, Solemn Benediction conflicts with the Byzantine sacramental discipline. Customarily, it has been Orthodox practice to shield the Eucharistic elements from the laity during the consecration so as to enhance the holy nature of the liturgical act. This has been done through excluding all elevations except at the end of the anaphora and by partitioning the eastern end off from the nave using the iconostasis. Where the elements are shown to the faithful, it is a part of the reception of communion rather than so that

---

[117] And, with more Western Rite Orthodox coming from among the Charismatic Episcopal Church, it is difficult to say that Reformed conceptions of the Eucharist were not held by formerly CEC parishes before or after becoming Orthodox.

[118] Daniel J. Sahas, *Logos and Icon: Sources in Eighth Century Iconoclasm* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 95-6.

[119] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentarii in Novum Testamentum* (*In Evangelium Matthaei Commentarii Fragmentum*), *PG* 66, 713/4 26.26.

[120] Hughes, 'Paraliturgical Devotions', 32.

they may be venerated abstractly. But the elevation, along with the Solemn Benediction, directly contradicts what has otherwise been the hiding of the consecration from the public view.[121] In some sense, this showing of the elements contradicts an Eastern understanding of the sacraments since,

> Eastern theology looks to the sacraments in their totality, and stresses what the whole does for the soul, insisting on the hidden, invisible aspects of the 'mysteries.' This authentic Byzantine tradition may be seen in almost every form of liturgical and spiritual life. The iconostasis 'hides' the sanctuary, the 'holy of holies,' the veil of the Royal Doors further hides the most holy, the Eucharist, from the gaze of profane eyes.[122]

So there are both positive and negative reasons for abandoning both a high elevation and ringing of bells during the *verba* and the practice of venerating the sacrament apart from the Eucharistic rite. On the negative side, the continuation of these practices represents an understanding of the Eucharist contrary to that which is known and expressed among the majority of Orthodox. On the positive side, the elimination of these practices would represent a move towards a more authentic Orthodox spirituality of the eucharistic liturgy, one which emphasizes the Eucharist as mystery and food to be received rather than a thing to be seen for its own sake.

Use of Leavened Bread

One readily identifiable difference between the Eucharistic practice of East and West is in the type of bread used for communion. The difference is obvious because the East uses bread which has been leavened while the West uses bread that is not. That the

---

[121] However, in the twentieth century, the deliberate hiding of the consecration from public view was reduced, first in Greece and later in North America. There has been a trend towards removing curtains from behind the Holy Doors in addition to keeping the doors open throughout the entirety of the liturgy (as well as at other times besides Bright Week). Iconostases are being made lower and less obstructive so that the laity will have a better view of the entire eucharistic liturgy. Even so, the laity cannot view the elements during the anaphora since the priest stands directly in front of the chalice and diskos, with both objects resting on the altar and the elevation at 'of Your own' is very slight.

[122] Kucharek, *The Sacramental Mysteries: A Byzantine Approach* (Allendale: Alleluia Press, 1976), 338. Of course, Kucharek represents a the Slavic tradition of Orthodoxy, and is in the position of perhaps justifying a practice which may prove to have been a transitory phase in Orthodoxy liturgy. Even taking this into consideration, the elements are still brought into the nave during the Great Entrance, where they were commonly venerated by the faithful even as early as the fourteenth century as Cabasilas attests, as he expresses significant displeasure this circumstance. See Cabasilas, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy,* 65-6.

variance of Eucharistic bread between East and West was a central cause of the rupture in 1054 is thoroughly documented.[123] Simultaneously, it should be noted that various polemical tracts from the same period chastise the Latins for various other liturgical and disciplinary practices which are at variance with Byzantine customs, including: not singing alleluia during Lent, consuming dairy products during the same period, and fasting on Saturdays of Lent, among other perceived infractions. However, it was the use of unleavened bread, or azymes, which caused the most controversy during and immediately after the events of 1054. The question of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist was to remain a significant point of dispute between East and West in the eleventh and twelfth century, though subsequent centuries saw it fade in importance in favour of the *filioque* and the question of papal primacy. The last major opposition to the use of azymes comes from Mark of Ephesus who regarded the Latin Eucharist as a 'dead sacrifice' because of the use of unleavened bread.[124]

Presently, the AWRV uses leavened bread which has been pressed into a flat wafer so that it resembles the unleavened host common in Western churches. In all likelihood, this practice was adopted so that Byzantine Rite Orthodox theological sensibilities would not be offended while simultaneously preserving the outward appearance of the historic Western practice.[125] Indeed, many Orthodox writers historically and presently presume that only the use of leavened bread is the historic practice of the Church, with the use of unleavened bread being an aberration of the common tradition of Christianity that arose among Armenians and Latins at a relatively late point. Michael Pomazansky provides an excellent summation of the Orthodox perspective on the history of eucharistic bread when he states that 'it is known that in Apostolic times – that is, from the very beginning, from its institution – the Eucharist was

[123] Cf. John H. Erickson, 'Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism 1054', *SVTQ* 14.1 (1970) 3-24; Edward Martin, 'The Bread of the Eucharist' (S.T.D. diss., Pontificiam Universitatem S. Thomae, 1970); and Smith, '*And Taking Bread…*'. This section is hardly intended as a through survey of the place of azymes in the Great Schism, but reference is made to the historical arguments against azymes put forward by Byzantine polemicists of the eleventh century. A much fuller understanding of the complexities of this situation can be found in the above mentioned documents, but especially in Erickson and Smith.

[124] Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence*(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 114.

[125] Overbeck himself displays evolving thought on the subject, originally advocating the use of leavened bread in 1867 to equivocating on matter in 1867 to demanding the use of leavened bread by 1881 as a matter of principle.

performed during the whole year, weekly, when the Jews did not prepare unleavened bread; this means that it was performed, even in the Jewish-Christian communities, with leavened bread.'[126] While his justification is perhaps taken to an extreme, his perspective is not an isolated one.

At the heart of the subject is the appropriate ancient use of the West. To be sure, there is also the canonical consideration in the form of Canon §11 of the Penthekte (or Quinisext) Synod, though we will approach the canonical questions related to Western Rite Orthodox in a Chapter 10. Even so, it is beyond the scope of the present work to make a decisively concluded what type of bread the early church used and at what poin the West began using unleavened bread. On the Latin side of the dispute at the turn of the millennium, the use of unleavened bread was advocated as the absolute apostolic tradition of the West, or at the very least was regarded as being of considerable antiquity.[127] Among attempts at a more even-handed approach to the question are the works by Reginald Wooley and Edward Martin, both of whom make notable efforts to survey the canonical literature of the first millennia related to Eucharistic bread, though arriving at vastly different conclusions.[128] What is problematic about the evidence is that it could be read either way. Martin's summation of the of the extant literature highlights the problem quite effectively, noting that

---

[126] Michael Pomazansky, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* (Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1994), 285. Obviously, the author is referencing the mitzvah to consume matzah for the celebration of Pesach. I find his assertion quite amusing since the mitzvah requires one to consume matzah on Nisan 14 (that is, at the Seder) and the Rabbis declare it meritorious to consume matzah during the entirety of the festival (though it is not require to consume matzah, only refrain from consuming chametz – leaven), matzah itself is available quite readily throughout the year. The assumption that Jews do not or did not eat matzah at more times of the year than just Passover demonstrates an otherwise understandable unfamiliarity with Jewish culture and history. Unfortunately, Pomazansky's uses this assertion to justify his own ideal wherein the possibility of the use of unleavened bread on a regular or semi-regular basis is excluded for every Christian community before the seventh century and as a result cannot simply be passed over in silence.

[127] Alcuin, writing ca. 800, is the earliest Western witness to the use of unleavened bread, but he does not give any indication that he considered azymes an innovation, recent or otherwise, leading us to conclude that the use of azymes in Frankish territories was already an old practice by the ninth century. For Alcuin's actual comments see *Epistola CXXXVII* (*ad Chrodgarium comitem*), *PL* 100, 376-7.

[128] Wooley concludes that leavened bread had always been the custom and unleavened bread was a recent innovation by the time of the azymite controversy in the eleventh century; Martin is more cautious in his conclusions, generally agreeing that unleavened bread was not the apostolic custom but concluding the use of unleavened bread was used much earlier than Wooley would otherwise concede. Cf. Reginald Wooley, *The Bread of the Eucharist* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1913) and Edward Martin, 'The Bread of the Eucharist'.

> Rabanus Maurus in the middle of the ninth century makes the first clear affirmation which would allow one to conclude that at least in some parts of Europe in his day, at some times at least, azyme bread was used for the Eucharist. The literary evidence alone does not tell us without some room for the opposite, whether leavened or unleavened bread was in use for the centuries before that. It does not tell us, moreover, how widespread the use of azymes was even in the ninth century. All one can be certain of is that by mid-eleventh century it was the custom throughout the West to use azyme bread.[129]

In that regard, there is little means of definitively determining how ancient the practice of the West, since we can conclude that unleavened bread was in general use throughout the West by the time of the Schism, we may be better served in looking at the arguments against the use of azymes.

Unfortunately, biblical literature is of little assistance in bringing a satisfactory resolution to the conflict. Both sides have historically used several proof texts of varying lengths as a means of supporting one position or another, whether Mt. 16.6 ('beware the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees') and 1 Cor. 6-8 ('let us keep the feast, not with the old yeast, the yeast of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth') on the side of the Latins and Mt. 13.33 ('The kingdom of heaven is like a little leaven') on the part of the Greeks. The appeal to such texts is an arbitrary one since there are numerous quotations in the Bible which speak of leaven as both a positive and negative thing, depending on the point which is to be made. More difficult was the Latin appeal to the Last Supper and its paschal setting as rationale for the use of azymes. Here, proponents of the Latin practice appealed to the Synoptic account which describes Christ as having consumed a legal Passover on the eve of Nisan 13/14, thus using unleavened bread, or following John as the Greeks did, Christ did not consume a legal Passover but an ordinary supper with leavened bread. There are specific contextual and sociological difficulties with either approach,[130] while New Testament scholars and liturgists have

[129] Martin, 'The Bread of the Eucharist', 183. This difficulty is further highlighted by the material evidence of early Medieval Christianity. Thomas O'Loughlin in *Celtic Theology* (London: Continuum, 2000), 134-5 mentions the size of the Derrynaflan paten (36 cm) as evidence that communion would have been served from a large loaf, rather than the small pre-cut pieces normally seen today. This reinforces Martin's conclusions that the progress of azymes in the West was uneven.

[130] One example would be the assumption that even if the meal in John's Gospel was not a Passover meal that there would have been ordinary bread available for consumption. The ritual for removing leaven from a home in preparation for Passover, known as *bedikit chometz*, is normally performed on the night before

attempted to harmonize or explain away one account or another in a variety of attempts to force the Last Supper to fit a pre-determined historical or liturgical mould.[131] Bradshaw perhaps best sums the problem of whether or not the Last Supper was a Passover meal by saying that, 'even if the Last Supper is not a Passover meal, it is still given that connotation by the Gospel writers.'[132]

This takes us to the primary set of arguments against azymes set forth by the Byzantine polemicists, what might be referred to as the Christological arguments. This line of thinking implies that, because there is a perceived 'deviation' in liturgical practice it must therefore represent some otherwise unspoken heretical conviction, such as we see in the arguments of Nikitas Stithatos, 'To employ bread without leaven is to imply that Christ was without a human soul and thus to fall into the heresy of Apollinaris' or Leo of Preslav 'To employ bread without leaven as a sign of divine purity is to deny the reality of the incarnation, and thus to fall into the heresies of Manes, Valentinus, Apollinaris, Paul of Samosata, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Severus, Sergius, and Pyrrhus.'[133] It is also possible that the Armenian use of unleavened bread for the Eucharist was problematic, especially since Armenia was officially Monophysite. Erickson points to knowledge of the Ebionites from the writings of Epiphanius and, closer to everyday experience in Byzantium, the Bogomils, Paulicians, and Manicheans, all of whom were active in Asia Minor at the time of the Great Schism.[134] But there is little objective reason to consider that the Latins were secretly Nestorian or Monophysite, as the arguments made by Byzantine polemicists require, so while the arguments hold a certain symbolic weight they actually have very little in the way of substance. Thus, we are actually back at the original problem: the authentic historic tradition of the Christian West which, as already has been mentioned, is either impossible to determine or is as certain as one's preconceived notions as to whether the primitive West did or did not use azymes in the celebration of the Eucharist.

---

the actual Passover meal, that is the evening of Nisan 13/14, which is when John's Gospel places the Last Supper. Automatically then one encounters the question of whether or not Jesus and his disciples would have been in possession of leavened bread in any case.

[131] Some of the more creative attempts involve various authors who self-identify as Messianic Jews and seek to identify the account of the Synoptic Gospels with the modern West-Ashkenazic form of the Seder.

[132] Bradshaw, *Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 145.

[133] Erickson, 'Leavened and Unleavened', *SVTQ* 14.3 (1970) 160.

[134] Ibid., 161.

It may well be, under the circumstances described above, that the Western Rite Orthodox made the best of an otherwise impossible situation, but one is left to wonder what good the use of leavened bread which nevertheless has the appearance of unleavened wafers can do. The primary symbols of the Orthodox eucharistic bread, namely all communing from one loaf, similarity to daily bread, and leaven as symbolic of new life in Christ, are all destroyed when bread is pressed into flat, round discs to resemble the Western host. The leavened wafer still retains the appearance of unleavened wafers (to the point that they are nearly indistinguishable, especially from the back of a church) and the symbolic function of growth, consubstantiality with humanity because of its resemblance to ordinary bread, and its representation of Christ's human and divine natures are wholly eradicated. The problem is not only that the AWRV uses leavened or unleavened bread per se; rather, the problem is that leavened bread is made in such a way as to mimic conventional Western use. The implied reason for maintaining a semblance of unleavened wafers, that of maintaining visual continuity with the West, is destroyed since the elements only appear to be similar; the same is true of the rationale for using leavened wafers: specifically using a bread of similar type as the rest of Orthodoxy. To that end, this particular choice seems to be one which has the markings of all the proper intentions, but is executed in a manner such that the letter has killed the spirit.

Naturally, we are led to question what would have been the best course of action to take, since it is presumed that, like the elevation, the retention of unleavened bread would be a significant problem from an historical and spiritual perspective. But, unlike the elevation it is perhaps more desirable that the use of unleavened bread be retained by Western rite. In the first place, the use of unleavened bread was at least the normative custom in the West by the time the conflict over azymes arose in the eleventh century and is probably considerably older. The normative nature of this use is at least tacitly confirmed by the continued use of leavened hosts for the celebration of the Eucharist in the Western rite. Even if this normal Western use is not recognized as the custom of the West in the pre-Schism period (through whatever flight of fancy necessary), it is at least understood as normal and legitimate since it is all but disregarded in current ecumenical conversations with the Roman Catholic Church, even where the explicit topic is divisions between East and West concerning the Eucharist.

Secondly, there is at least a biblical rationale for continuing the use azymes; that is to say the West can still point to the Synoptic accounts of a real Passover meal eaten by Jesus and his disciples and conclude that unleavened bread was used and is therefore appropriate for the Eucharist. The Byzantine scriptural argument, as summarized by Erickson,[135] on the other hand, does have its distinctive defects. In part, the argument that ordinary bread is intended by the Gospel account cannot be sustained since αρτος can be used for bread of any sort, as can the Hebrew equivalent *lechem*. Leo of Ochrid's argument that Christ ate a lawful Passover on Nisan 14 and then used leavened bread for the sacrament must be rejected as highly unlikely and, on further consideration, a little silly. Both arguments succumb to the problems related to particular mitzvot of Passover. Similarly Simeon of Jerusalem's argument requires ignoring the Synoptic account altogether. And, as we have seen, the Byzantine argument from scripture can lead to erroneous claims about the nature of early Christianity and Judaism, such as expressed by Pomazansky above all in the name of supporting the claim that unleavened bread was not and could not have been used in early Christianity or even at the Last Supper.

Finally, the argument from Byzantine eucharistic spirituality is what gets us to the central distinction between the legitimacy of the elevation on the one hand and the use azymes on the other. While both are in some sense understood as contrary to the Byzantine spiritual tradition, they nevertheless are disregarded by two different competing strains of that tradition. The argument from the elevation rises out of the legitimate understanding of the Eucharist as primarily a 'mystery,' something not to be gazed upon for its own sake, but to be received. After all, Christ does not say, 'take and see,' but tells the disciples to 'take and eat.' By contrast, the arguments against the azymes arise from what Paul Meyendorff calls 'flights of allegorism'.[136] He traces the development of in liturgical interpretation, pointing to the iconoclastic period as a time of shift from the Alexandrian 'spiritualized' type of interpretation typified by Maximus the Confessor a century earlier which emphasized an eschatological dimension to the liturgy, to a more Antiochene approach characterized by Germanus of Constantinople in the

[135] Ibid., 160.
[136] Paul Meyendorff, 'Eastern Liturgical Theology' in Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq (eds.), *Christian Spirituality Origins to the Twelfth Century* (New York: Crossroads Publishing Co., 1987), 361.

eighth century which understood the liturgy as a representation of the life of Christ.[137] Ironically, this change in perspective was itself occasioned by the dispute over the Eucharist, with the Iconoclasts insisting that the elements of communion were the only valid representation of Christ.[138] Since every aspect of the Eucharist had to represent Christ in some way, we ultimately come to the place where the Latins could be accused of Apollinarianism, for example, because they do not use leavened bread, even though this is clearly not the case.

Ultimately, the choice to utilize leavened bread shaped like a normal host has its own distinct disadvantages in terms of fidelity to the rite while they offer some distinct advantages in terms of making the Western rite acceptable to other Orthodox. The change that has been made to the Western use is ultimately incidental since, even on close inspection, the observer will note little difference between the Western Orthodox practice and that of the non-Western Orthodox. As I have implied, there are better places which the Western rite should seek to alter practice to demonstrate greater conformity and sensitivity to Byzantine Rite Orthodox. While it would be better for the Western rite to return to using unleavened bread, if the use of leavened bread is insisted upon, it is perhaps better than the bread be prepared in the Byzantine style, that of a large loaf with the particle for communion cut from it, rather than using a host which is indistinguishable from the non-Orthodox counterpart.

[137] Ibid., 357-60.
[138] See 150 n115 above.

CHAPTER 7
THE SANCTIFICATION OF TIME

In looking through the ordinary of the Orthodox Western rite's eucharistic liturgies, we have noted how they developed from their original Western models, have viewed how Western eucharistic liturgies were revised to bring them into conformity with Orthodoxy, and how those revisions have failed to address some significant problems while simultaneously introducing new problems. However, the ordinary is not the only part of the liturgy, since the eucharistic liturgy has variable elements known as the propers, so called because they are associated with a specific Sunday, festival, or saint on the calendar. The propers consist of: the introit at the start of mass, the collect before the lessons, the lessons themselves, the chants that cover the space between the reading of the lesson, and variable prayers associated with the offertory and with communion. These propers, along with the Liturgy of the Hours, with its marking specific hours of the day for prayer, constitute what might be broadly referred to as the sanctification of time. Here we shall refer to the variable portions of the eucharistic liturgy, specifically the lectionary and calendar, along with the daily office as the bridge between the primary Sunday service in the Eucharist and the more occasional liturgies which celebrate individual sacraments.

The Lectionary

One element of the Western rite eucharistic liturgy which has not received significant attention is the lectionary. This is partly because previous studies of the liturgy, such as those of Smith and Woolfenden, were only concerned with the ordinary of the liturgy, and not with its propers. Furthermore, both studies are limited by their use

of the *SASB*, rather than *TOM*, since the *SASB* does not include a lectionary.[1] We actually know very little about the lectionary before the fourth century. At some point specific readings became associated with specific festivals, like Luke 2 at Christmas, but there is no early evidence of a fixed lectionary for non-festal; Sundays. Furthermore, the existing references in patristic sermons like those of John Chrysostom or Augustine of Hippo are not unhelpful for determining any sort of sequence to the readings, nor is there necessarily evidence of *lectio continua*, even though it is widely assumed that continuous reading through the Bible was a fixture of early Christian liturgy.[2] The creation of a festal calendar is directly connected to the development of the lectionary. During the fourth century, the Jerusalem Church saw the rise of multiple, discrete commemorations of events from Jesus life interspersed throughout the calendar on the date they had supposedly taken place.[3] This process was already present in the third century, but gained speed in the fourth century, due in part to the expectations of pilgrims coming to the Holy Land, to the point that originally distinct celebrations like Holy Week became connected with the events of Jesus' last days rather than just preparation for baptism at the paschal vigil.[4] As discrete celebrations came to exist on the Church's calendar, the readings at the liturgy would be taken from those portions of the Bible which could be related to the celebration. For Sundays, the pericopes were probably chosen by the bishop in each location, with the choices of bishop in important sees eventually influencing the choices of less important churches, thus accounting for the widely different lectionaries within the East and West.[5]

Originally, the Roman lectionary contained three lessons: one from the Old Testament, one from the Epistles, and one from the Gospels. We still see this arrangement in the liturgy for Good Friday which, which maintained the three lessons for this one day even as most other days were reduced to two lessons. In addition to the three lesson lectionary that was used the Armenian, Ambrosian, and Mozarabic rites,[6] while

[1] There is one exception, in that the *SASB* does provide the lessons for Ash Wednesday, though only because the liturgy is printed in its entirety in the book, including the lessons.
[2] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 157.
[3] Thomas J. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (New York: Pueblo, 1986), 38.
[4] Ibid., 40ff.
[5] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 157.
[6] Parsch, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 133.

the Byzantine rite also possessed three lessons at one point.[7] At some point, the Roman rite dropped the first lesson from the Old Testament on Sundays leaving only the Epistle and the Gospel, though, as there were normally only two lessons on ferial weekdays and weekday fasts, the Old Testament lesson was retained there.[8] The lectionary in the Western Church varied from diocese to diocese, even among those using the Roman rite, until the standardization of the missal in 1570 simultaneously standardized the lectionary according to the Roman form. The *BCP*, while making heavy editorial changes to the collects appointed for various Sundays, kept the medieval Sarum lectionary with considerably less amendment, although specific reasons for changes between the missal and the *BCP*, and the English and American lectionaries are not always clear.[9]

The Western Rite Orthodox have generally kept the two lectionaries, Episcopal and Roman, as they were prior to Vatican II. *TOM* appoints two sets of lessons: one set is drawn from the 1928 American *BCP* while alternatives are provided from the Readings for Mass of the Roman rite. In general, the system is relatively straightforward. However, there are notable peculiarities within the lectionary system itself. On some Sundays, the lessons in the Roman rite and the *BCP* are the same and so only one set of lessons is provided; occasionally, one set is provided even though the Roman lectionary and the 1928 American *BCP* differ on the the choice of one or both lessons. A good example is the Second Sunday in Lent, where the 1928 American *BCP* Gospel appointed is Mt. 15.21-28 in the *BCP* and *TOM*, but the Roman Gospel is Mt. 17.1-9. Other times, the Roman sequence is preferred over the *BCP* sequence, or the lesson used in the *BCP* will be lengthened or shortened by *TOM* for reasons which are not always apparent. No less confusing is the arrangement of lessons, with those Advent 1 to Pentecost are sequenced together regardless of origin, and for the period following Pentecost are presented as separately by counting Sundays after Trinity as in the *BCP* (for TIK) or after Pentecost (for GRE) as in the Roman missal.

It is clear that, along with the changes to the Roman rite and the 1928 American *BCP*, Western Rite Orthodoxy has resisted similar developments in the eucharistic lectionary, though without specifically providing any reasons for rejecting the revised

[7]Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slave Liturgy*, 419-20.
[8] Ibid., 133.
[9] Shepherd, *Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*, 90.

lectionary. Criticisms of the revised lectionary range from the sublime to the unusual, including frustration with *NOM* renaming the Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost as 'Ordinary' on the grounds that no Sunday should be 'ordinary'.[10] However, more meaningful critiques of the three year lectionary are to be found, including the assertion that the new lectionary does 'unprecedented violence to the objective traditional liturgy',[11] it is cumbersome because of its variety of readings, that the multiplicity of lessons places an onerous burden on Church musicians to train choirs in proper chants,[12] and that the three year lectionary does an insufficient job of promoting lessons from the Old Testament.

The second criticism is often supported with the argument that the faithful are insufficiently engaged with the texts, and that three texts create a burden for them to hear; they become unfamiliar with the texts in the lectionary year to year and as such are less biblically literate than under the one year lectionary, and preachers find difficulty linking multiple texts together in their sermons. However, it seems a bit disingenuous to regard the number and variety of readings across a three year cycle as a particularly cumbersome problem. Certainly, incorporating three readings which are not always obviously connected thematically is a challenge from an homiletic perspective, but it is not one that is impossible to surmount. Furthermore, one wonders how well the laity would recall individual lessons year to year on a one year cycle. This seems less difficult with a one year lectionary and for important days, like Christmas and Easter, laity may recall the specific lesson, like the Gospel lesson; however, it seems considerably less likely that the laity would know, for example, that Eph. 4.1-6 is the appointed Epistle on the Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost without having to reference a table of lessons. One suspects that not a few clergy in the same predicament. This disingenuous nature extends

[10] This is perhaps one of the more amusing complaints, particularly since 'ordinary' refers not to the colloquial sense of 'average' or 'plain', but rather to the fact that the Sundays are 'ordered' numerically, hence the Latin name 'ordinaris'. No doubt, some opponents of Ordinary Time are concerned that the faithful will take the colloquial English sense rather than the intended meaning, but we are left begging the question of why proper catechetical instruction will solve the numerous perceived difficulties arising from the Tridentine rite, but the same method could not be pressed to serve an infinitely simpler case of misunderstanding.

[11] Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of Liturgy* (Farnborough: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2004), 177.

[12] Jeffrey Tucker, 'Doubts About the Three-Year Cycle', *New Liturgical Movement* (15 January 2010) at <<http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2010/01/doubts-about-three-year-calendar.html>> (accessed 21 June 2010).

to the third objection, which is primarily concerned with having to train choirs to sing proper chants for one Sunday and not use them again for three years, by which time they are forgotten; if the choir is not a professional body, one wonders just how well they would remember chants from year to year.[13]

The third criticism deserves extended consideration. Many challenge the Old Testament lesson not out of opposition to reading the Old Testament, but because the lessons chosen are often typological reasons, rather than allowing the text to speak for itself as a unit of scripture.[14] Of course, this typological selection is common in the one year lectionary, since the few Old Testament lessons there are equally typological.[15] Other authors, such as László Dobszay assert that 'more recent studies have given rise to serious doubts' about whether or not there were ever three lessons at the Roman mass on any but the most solemn occasions.[16] There are also concerns over whether or not the Mass is the most appropriate place to expand the lectionary, noting that other times, like Bible studies and parish retreats, or at the Daily Office are more appropriate for meditating on the scriptures.[17] More to the question is the content of the Roman and Episcopal lectionaries, and how much of the scriptures are actually read in a given year. For the Roman Gospels, Matthew makes up the majority of the year with twenty-one Sunday appointments, just over 40%; Luke is next with eighteen Sundays (34.6%) and John is third with twelve (23%), while Mark is dead last with a meagre three lessons (5.76%). And, while the Roman lectionary does contain some readings from the Old Testament, not including psalms or parts of psalms that from the introit or the gradual but including the readings at the Easter vigil which were suppressed in 1951, the amount is a

[13] To this author, the problem seems to have less to do with problem with the infrequency of lectionary readings, or infrequent recycling of proper chants, and more to do with the history of Church music in the Catholic Churches in the United States. In this regard, Thomas Day, *Why Catholics Can't Sing: The Culture of Catholicism and the Triumph of Bad Taste* (York: Crossroad, 1990), is instructive with regards to the history of music in American Catholicism both before and after Vatican II.

[14] Walter Sundberg, 'Limitations of the Lectionary', *Word and World* 10.1 (1990) , 18.

[15] Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* I, 396-7.

[16] László Dobszay, *The Bugnini-Liturgy and the Reform of the Reform* (Front Royal: Church Music Association of America, 2003), 134. Unfortunately, Dobszay does not indicate which 'recent studies' have expressed such doubt, nor does he provide explicit reasons for doubting this conclusion in this text or his revisit of *NOM* in *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite* (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

[17] Dobszay, *The Bugnini-Liturgy*, 123. Of course, this naturally begs the question of how many laity actually pray the office, either privately or in common, especially considering that the Roman office as presently designed does not take lay participation or private recitation into account.

mere 1.02% of the text read in a year; while 11% of the Epistles are read and 22.4% for the Gospels,[18] the lower percentage of the epistolary coverage owing to the fact that the Sunday lesson is built around the Gospel and that some Epistles are only a few verses. Given these statistics it is reasonable to conclude that adding Old Testament lessons, even if de-contextualised, abbreviated, or overly typological, is better than the alternative of reading nearly nothing at all from what amounts to more than three-fourths of the Bible.

The first objection to the lectionary, specifically that altering the lectionary does violence to the traditional rite, is probably the reason that resonate the most among Western Rite Orthodox. In this regard, fidelity to the one year lectionaries is based on fidelity to the rite and not fidelity to the sequence of lessons as such. There are those within Traditionalist Catholic or Continuing Anglican groups who attach a mystical significance to the sequence in the lectionary, and are therefore opposed to the three year lectionary on those grounds. Specifically, there is the notion that the individual Gospel reading specifically provides a mystical focus and theme to each Sunday of the temporal cycle as well as looking to find mystical meaning in the life of Jesus rather than simply reading through the Gospels as a biography like we see in the three year cycles.[19] Simultaneously, the three year lectionary is not devoid of mystical meaning in the least. The best example is spreading the Johannie Gospels (Jn. 4, 9, and 11) across Lent. These lessons were traditionally read on the Sundays in Lent during the scrutinies that concluded the adult catechumenate, but were transferred to the fourth Thursday in Lent as adult baptism died out. The redistribution allows a recovering of the mystic paschal symbolism that should characterize Lenten preparations.[20] However, there is no evidence that a desire to preserve any mystical characteristics of the lectionary is prevalent in Western Rite Orthodoxy. In all likelihood, Western Rite Orthodox would support the use of the lectionary based on the other objections mentioned above, but would have little motivation to consider lectionary revision because it is simply regarded as an inherited

[18] These statistics are based on the total number of verses read throughout the year divided by the total number of verses in the section of the Bible. The Old Testament includes the Deuterocanonical books identified as scripture in the Roman Catholic Church; using a Greek version of the Bible, the number of verses would be slightly less. The number of verses for the Old Testament does not include verses from the Psalms, nor are psalm versus used in the mass counted. The Section for the Gospels includes the verses for the four Gospels only, while that of the Epistles includes the New Testament without the four Gospels.
[19] Dobszay, *The Bugnini-Liturgy*, 129-30.
[20] Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 60-1.

part of the rite. Furthermore, as already demonstrated, Western Rite Orthodox are willing to modify the lectionary as it suits, even when there is no readily discernable rationale behind the modifications.

One problem which has seemingly been resolved by Western Rite Orthodox is the relationship between the temporal and the sanctoral cycles. In the old Roman lectionary, commemoration of saints and octaves would frequently disrupt the temporal cycle of lessons, especially in the period after Epiphany and Pentecost. Vatican II corrected the problem by allowing only a very few days to have any precedence over a ferial Sunday so that the temporal cycle is respected on the vast majority of Sundays. Western Rite Orthodox have taken a different though less satisfactory approach to the problem by eliminating the commons of various categories of saints, thus reducing flexibility in the liturgy. While most Sundays have a set of propers, not all saints' commemorations have propers, but in the Roman rite there are proper texts and lessons which can be used in the absence of a specific proper for the saint. Thus, for example, neither St Marcellus (16 January) or St Polycarp (26 January) have associated propers, so to commemorate both individuals on their respective days, the same (common) propers would be used. However, *TOM* has eliminated commons for all categories of saints so that only those saints with proper masses remain. Thus, there is no way for the commemoration of a saint to intrude on the Sunday in the vast majority of instances, though it is also true that there is no direct means to commemorate the saint in the liturgy, except by mention in the canon. Thus, we are left with a desirable result in the priority of Sunday, but through means which are not wholly congenial.

In general, the lectionary as it existed in the 1928 American *BCP* and the Tridentine rite has remained the same in Western Rite Orthodoxy. However, this sameness is due to Western Rite Orthodox general fidelity to the Western liturgy prior to Vatican II and not out of concerns over the mystical nature of the lectionary itself. It is reasonable that Western Rite Orthodox would voice objection to the three year lectionary on many of the same grounds used by Traditionalist Catholics and Continuing Anglican groups, but this cannot be stated absolutely as there has been little consideration of the lectionary, either from an apologetic or mystagogical perspective.

The Calendar

The actual calendar used by Western Rite Orthodox is, with some modifications, the same calendar as the General Roman Calendar of 1954, issued by Pope Pius XII. The Western rite calendar uses the same types of rankings for feasts, with individual day being classified as Double I class, Double II class, Greater Double, Double, and Simple, with I and II class doubles being first distinguished as privileged. Any feast or festival listed as a lower class can be transferred to a feria or given precedence over a simple day if displaced by a higher ranking festival on its appointed day. Additionally, the ferias in Lent and Advent are given precedence over non-privileged feasts. Like the 1954 calendar, the Western rite calendar has suppressed the rank of semi-double, with the exception that semi-double is maintained for the intervening days of an octave.

However, there are differences from the 1954 calendar. First, and most obvious, the commemoration of saints who lived after 1054 are suppressed since these are not considered saints of the Orthodox Church. Thus, St Francis of Assisi is not commemorated at all in the Western rite calendar, though he would have appeared in the 1954 calendar on October 4. Less obvious is the suppression of the feast of the Theotokos ordered by Pius on May 31, which is suppressed in the Orthodox Western calendar. Furthermore, the feast of Sts Philip and James remains in its pre-1954 place on May 1. The calendar also maintains the various octaves beyond those for Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost: St Stephen, St John, the Holy Innocents, St Lawrence, Epiphany, Corpus Christi, the Ascension, the Sacred Heart, Conception of Mary, the Assumption, Nativity of St John the Baptist, Sts Peter and Paul, All Saints, and All Saints each have an associated octave. The octave of St Joseph is since the feast of St Joseph is absent from the Western Rite Orthodox calendar, and the octave for a church's patron is also eliminated; hosever, an octave is added for St Benedict. Consequently, the multitude of octaves does create confusion, even more so than was created with the calendar of Pius X. The General Calendar issued in 1954 included particular rankings for each of the octaves. The Octaves of Easter and Pentecost were considered to have the highest rank, wherein no other feast or commemoration was permitted; the second level included Epiphany and Corpus Christi, while third place was assigned to Christmas, Ascension and Sacred Heart; the remaining octaves were divided common and simple octaves, and

each of the categories included rules for what level of commemoration or festival could take precedence over the days in the octave, as well as the octave day itself. On the other hand, the Western rite calendar ranks octave days according to Privileged First Order, Privileged Third Order, and Semi-Double, omitting a few of the categories that were present in the 1955 hierarchy.

As already stated, the Orthodox Western Rite Calendar does include a number of post-Schism Orthodox saints, though perhaps not as many as one may expect. The non-Western Saints inserted into the calendar include New Martyrs of Russia (February 4), St Tikhon of Moscow (April 7), St Segius of Radonesh (July 18), Sts Boris and Gleb (July 24), St Seraphim of Sarov (August 1), St Gorazd of Prague (September 4), St Raphael of Brooklyn (between November 3 and 7), and St Gregory Palamas (November 14). Of these, only the New Martyrs, St Tikhon, and St Raphael have propers associated with their feasts. The provenance of easch set of propers varies by festival, though none are based on the troparion or kantakion in the Byzantine rite. For the New Martyrs, the Introit and Lessons are taken from the common of martyrs in the Roman rite, but the collect is a new composition specifically for the occasion. This is equally true for St Tikhon and St Raphael, of which neither bear any resemblance to the troparion or kantakion or to the existing commons either for bishops, confessors, or missionaries in the Roman rite. Thus, they are free compositions

Simultaneously, there are features of the Orthodox Western Rite calendar which distinguish it from Orthodox and Western analogues. One prominent feature is a feast dedicated to the company of Old Testament saints on the octave of All Saints (November 8). The festival itself is not historically part of the Roman rite, but was introduced to its current location by Alexander Turner in the 1960s.[21] It was subsequently claimed that the festival was adapted from a similar commemoration in the Byzantine rite.[22] However, there are sufficient reasons for doubting this assertion. The closest analogue in the Byzantine rite is the Sunday of the Forefathers, which takes place on what would be the Third Sunday of Advent, and the Sunday of the Holy Fathers, which takes place on the following Sunday. The second of the two commemorations is the most correct

[21] A. Turner, 'A Mass Commemorating the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Law', *Orthodoxy* 9.1 (1961) 29.
[22] AWRV, *Ordo* (Stanton: St. Luke's Priory Press, 2004), np.

comparison as it celebrates all of the Old Testament saints, though the first comparison is included for completeness even though the liturgical focus is specifically Christ's ancestors, with emphasis on the patriarch Abraham. Furthermore, the propers provided for the Western rite are dissimilar to the proper elements of the Byzantine rite for the same commemorations. Within the Byzantine rite for the Sunday of the Forefathers, the Epistle for the Sunday is Col. 3.4-11 and the Gospel is Lk. 14.16-24; for the Sunday of the Holy Fathers it is Heb. 11.9-10, 17-23, 32-40 and Mt. 1.1-25 for Epistle and Gospel, respectively. The Western rite provides Deut. 28.17-19 and Mt. 5.13-18. That the collect does not resemble the Troparion or Kantakion for either commemoration should not be surprising since the collects for Eastern saints inserted in the Western rite calendar do not use these sources either.

The text of the collect was already provided by Alexander Turner in *Orthodoxy*,[23] and the Western Rite *Ordo* states that the feast was instituted under Turner's direction. However, the Episcopal Church in the *Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer* included a commemoration of 'Old Testament Men and Women'[24] but the text included no propers for mass or office; presumably, since the commemoration was the octave of All Saints which were provided with propers, these or the common of saints would have been used for the commemoration of Old Testament Men and Women. Ultimately, the commemoration was dropped on concerns of tokenism[25] and 8 November remained a ferial day. There were no propers for the feast in the draft prayerbook, and the propers in the Western rite antedate those in the draft prayerbook in any case. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the collect is a free composition, like what we see in commemorating post-schism Eastern saints. What remains to be demonstrated effectively is where Turner's inspiration for such a festival came from. While the *Ordo* claims that Turner was inspired by the Eastern rites which do possess such a festival, the placement does not coincide with the nearest presumed relative in the Byzantine rite, nor does it share similarity with Byzantine propers. The Byzantine arrangement seems sensible, but in the Western rite, this Sunday is already taken by the calling of Philip and Nathaniel

[23] A. Turner, 'A Mass Commemorating the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Law', *Orthodoxy* 9.1 (1961) 29.
[24] The Episcopal Church, *Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer* (Church Hymnal Corp., 1976), 15.
[25] Philip H. Pfatteicher, *Festivals and Commemorations: A Handbook to the calendar in the* Lutheran Book of Worship (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1980), 19.

with its emphasis on the disciples seeing even greater miracles, providing symmetry with the first Sunday after Easter, where the Gospel is traditionally Thomas' doubt and the greater blessing of believing while having not seen. In that regard, the octave of All Saints, while not the best choice, is probably the best available option.

Even less satisfying are the lessons chosen for the date, focusing on Deut. 18.17-19 ('I will raise up a prophet like [Moses]') and Mt. 5.13-18 ('You are the salt of the earth...'). The Gospel selection is acceptable, but a better choice might have been Jn. 8.48-58 ('Before Abraham was, I am') due to the symmetry it provides between Christ's own identity and the lives of the patriarchs which prefigured Jesus life, especially Abraham. For the first lesson, the obvious choice would seem to be Heb. 11. The entire chapter would be an appropriate, if lengthy, lesson since it summarises the main themes of the Hebrew Bible, but it is perhaps best to begin the reading at verse 24 and continue to the end of the chapter. It is unclear why Heb. 11 was not selected as the Epistle, unless there was a desire to avoid what seems to be the obvious selection. Furthermore, the selection of Deuteronomy, while laudable from the perspective that an Old Testament lesson should be used for a festival celebrating figures from the Old Testament, gives in to a typological snare. Furthermore, it does not itself seem to fit with the Gospel that has been selected, though it would fit better with Jn. 8.48-58.

There is little which is particularly remarkable about the Western Rite Orthodox calendar, since it has been brought over without significant changes. The most obvious changes, such as removing post-Schism Western saints and adding post-Schism Eastern saints, can be considered a matter of course and in some ways is little different from what Eastern Rite Orthodox face with regard to pre-Schism Western saints and their inclusion in calendars in the diaspora. The most remarkable feature of the calendar is the addition of the new festival on 8 November, something nearly unprecedented in the Western calendar. However, the implementation of the commemoration for Old Testament figures has not been implemented with the kind of careful consideration we might expect and, as such, represents something of a lost opportunity. Equally bothersome is the confused blending of the 1954 calendar with some pre-1954 rules, creating a hodgepodge of festival rankings without really solving any of the problems associated with the pre-1954

rules; in fact, Western Rite Orthodox have created more problems rather than making fewer with the rules as they have been implemented.

The Liturgy of the Hours

The daily prayer of the church, known as the Liturgy of the Hours or the Divine Office in the West, is an important component of the liturgical activity of Christianity. The Jewish antecedents for regularly scheduled prayer times throughout the day are presumed as obvious antecedents for early Christian prayer.[26] Within the New Testament, there are scant hints of Christian worship other than the Sunday service; most daily prayer would have been individual prayer rather than corporate prayer. *The Didache*, roughly contemporary with the Synoptic Gospels, commands recitation of the Lord's Prayer three times daily, though this is not necessarily evidence of three times for corporate prayer.[27] Certainly, there is no hint of an all-night vigil, which would acquire importance in later Christianity.[28] Second century writers do not speak significantly on prayer or prayer forms, with most authors focusing on the symbolic value of the rising and setting sun.[29]

In the third century, we find numerous references to daily prayer, as well as to the particular hours of prayer. Clement of Alexandria notes fixed hours for prayer, occurring at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, with bedtime, during the night and at mealtimes also constituting times for prayer, though noting that the fervent believer will pray perpetually.[30] Clement also mentions the Christian custom of praying towards the East and the rising sun and its Christological significance.[31] Origen, Clements successor as head of the catechetical school in Alexandria, reports only four set times for prayer (morning, noon, evening, and night),[32] but mentions Psalm 140 in relation to prayer, as did Clement, though Origen specifically states that it is connected to evening prayer.[33]

---

[26] Woolfenden, *Daily Liturgical Prayer*, (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004) 9-10.
[27] See Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life in the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* (New York: Newman Press, 2003), 308-9 for aspects of prayer in the Didache.
[28] Geoffrey G. Cuming, 'New Testament Foundation for Common Prayer', *SL* 10.3-4 (1974) 101.
[29] Woolfenden, *Daily Liturgical Prayer*, 12-4.
[30] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 7.7 *PG* 9, 455/6 and *Pedagogue* 2.9, *PG* 8, 493/4
[31] Clement, *Stromata* 7.7, 461/2-463/4
[32] Origen, *Libellus de Oratione* 32, PG 11, 555/6-557/8.
[33] Ibid, 555/6-557/8

Tertullian is more specific, including rubrics on when to stand or kneel, as opposed to just the hours or orientation of prayer, though he does provide these as well.[34] He also attests to the use of psalmody as a part of corporate prayer. Robert Taft identifies Apology 39 as the earliest description of *lucernarium*, or the lamp-lighting ritual that became a part of cathedral vespers.[35] We cannot be certain what the content of the prayer service was at this point, though we can conclude that that some hours had fixed psalms associated with them, such as Psalm 140's association with Vespers. Furthermore, we can conclude that the prayer offices contained non-Biblical hymns as Eusebius reports that third century heretics also sang hymns, thus creating a problem for the orthodox parties;[36] the use of scriptural readings, except for Egypt and Cappadocia, does not arise until much later However, much more cannot be said without venturing into the realm of unwarranted speculation.

As with the eucharistic liturgy, evidence for Christian prayer becomes more certain in the latter half of the fourth century, with a veritable explosion of liturgical material that accompanied the public toleration of Christianity during the reign of Constantine. The rapid pace of liturgical evolution during this period easily leads one to conclude that we are witnessing a revolution in Christian daily prayer, even though the different churches are building on what was already known. The period also sees the division between types of offices, the cathedral office and the monastic office. These terms were first proposed by Anton Baumstark to designate the daily prayer as it was celebrated in a parochial setting, while the latter designated the form of daily prayer as used by monks.[37] Structurally, the cathedral office consisted of a more dramatic ritual, involving more ministers and limited psalmody based on their suitability for the particular hour; the monastic office, by contrast, featured more or less continuous

---

[34] Tertullian, *Apologeticus Adversos Gentes Pro Christianis* 16, *PL* 1, 425-8; *Ad nations*, 1.13, PL 1, 650; *Ad Uxorem* 23, *PL* 1, 1298-9 and 25, *PL* 1, 1300-1301.
[35] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, 18.
[36] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 30, *PG* 20, 713/4.
[37] Anton Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1958), 111-29. These terms are not without their limits, and there has been considerable refinement in the way these terms are used (including identification of a 'city' monastic form and a 'desert' monastic form by Juan Mateos, 'The Origins of the Divine Office', *Worship* 41.8 (1967) 477-485; but this thesis without critics, including George Guiver, *Company of Voices: Daily Prayer and the People of God* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1988), and Paul Bradshaw, 'Cathedral and Monastic: What's in a Name?', *Worship* 77.4 (2003) 341-53.

psalmody, usually chanted antiphonally with a soloist and response or simply verse by verse, and lacking in accompanying ceremonial and number of clergy.[38]

For the Eastern history of the office, we have an abundance of witnesses attesting to the form of the cathedral office, though there is a significant lack of material for the monastic office. Though these offices varied considerably based on region there are some commonalities, notably the near universal use of Ps. 140, often accompanied by incense, as a part of Vespers. Taft goes into greater detail concerning the shape of the Eastern cathedral office[39] and Woolfenden largely follows Taft's lead, though with a more extensive consideration of the potential form of the monastic office.[40] Since the early structure of the Eastern offices does not concern us, it is sufficient to note their possible reconstructions in other works. More important for our consideration is the structure of the office in the West, and here the situation is very nearly the reverse of that in the East. The majority of evidence for the Western office, including North Africa, is primarily drawn from monastic sources. In some instances, such as the cathedral office at Rome, there are significant question of if there is a distinct cathedral office or if the office used in Rome would be an example of the urban monastic type.[41] This is particularly true since reconstructions of the old Roman office rely on the Benedictine Rule's description of the office, since Benedict states that his *Rule* takes the Roman use into account in structuring the prayer life for the monks.[42] The earliest firm evidence for the office in the city of Rome are *Ordines romani XVIII* and *XIX*, both of which refer back to the Benedictine Rule; even here there is doubt about their reliability for the form of the Roman cathedral rite.[43]

The hours of the Roman rite were not the only form of the liturgy of the hours in the West, nor were they the most important, though obviously they came to dominate the Western church eventually. Alongside the Roman hours, as with the eucharistic liturgy,

---

[38] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, 32-3, 54.
[39] Ibid., 31-56 and 273-91, the latter specifically detailing the development of the Byzantine office.
[40] Woolfenden, *Daily Liturgical Prayer*; esp. 49 ff. For his reconstruction of the monastic office's history.
[41] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, 131.
[42] Benedict of Nursia, *Regula*, *PL* 66, 418.
[43] Guy Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of the Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the Fifth Through the Tenth Century* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1957), 396-7. However, see Steven J. P. van Dijk, 'The Medieval Easter Vespers of the Roman Clergy', *Sacris Erudiri* 19 (1969-70), 327, where he argues that *Ordo Romanus XII* as seventh-century fragment of Roman Paschal Vespers.

there existed forms for the office proper to the Mozarabic, Celtic, Gallican, Milanese and North African rites; with the exception of the last, these forms for the office survive today, though to a lesser extent than in their prime.[44] There also existed a distinct form of the office particular to the Benedictine monastic tradition. Chapters 8-19 of the *Benedictine Rule* are exclusively concerned with regulating the divine office, including the number of offices, there length, and the amount of psalmody they contain.[45] In structuring the office, Benedict is certainly adapting other sources, most notably the *Rule of the Master*, and probably the Roman form of the office.[46] Charlamagne's promotion of the *Benedictine Rule* throughout monasteries in his domain ensured that this form of the office would continue even as local forms began to die out.

The cathedral office in the West underwent a further revolution with the development of the parochial system during the Middle Ages. Initially in the West, clergy would have resided in the city and served the cathedral of the bishop; when clergy were needed for rural areas or smaller towns, they would be sent by the bishop from the cathedral, but the central church of the diocese otherwise remained the place for baptism and celebrating feasts.[47] Subsequently, clergy came to be permanently assigned to the rural or suburban churches, and ultimately many of them acquired their own baptisteries, and strictly defined by geographic limits, resulting in the medieval parish church. Though originally suburban churches would have been staffed my multiple clergy led by a senior presbyter, eventually these came to be served by a single priest, responsible for all the liturgical celebrations and cure of souls.

Among the results derived by this change was the creation of single priest parishes, the lone cleric overworked and overextended, faced with the public recitation of an office largely shaped by monastic spirituality and with little time for anything else. A number of inventive solutions were attempted, including celebrating the offices in a rotation among individual parishes, with one parish praying a specific hour in turn daily, but the ultimate solution was to suppress the public celebration of the office and replace it with private recitation by the parish priest. Even where there were a sufficient number of

[44] See Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, 93-120, 141-164, for a description of monastic offices outside Italy, and of the cathedral office in the West more generally.
[45] Ibid., 130-8.
[46] Ibid., 130.
[47] Ibid., 298.

clerics in major or minor orders to make public celebration possible, the shift was towards private recitation was inevitable.[48] Private celebration of the office had been common in monasteries, though monks who were unable to celebrate in common were required at least to recite the office on their own at the appointed hour.[49] In cities, particularly at cathedrals, where there were several clergy serving in a single church, we see movement towards requiring clergy to live in common, even if they were not monks, this itself as a result of an increasingly celibate priesthood. Augustine of Hippo had already required his clergy to live communally, and Chrodegang of Metz, ca. 760, instituted a rule for the secular clergy, including requirements to say the office, with a natural model found in the monastic form for the office.[50] The result was that the office became more and more the personal domain of the clergy rather than an authentic source of lay or communal spirituality, commonly identified as an increasing monasticisation of the Western clergy.[51]

Further development in the books of the office came during the thirteenth century with the rise of the mendicant monastic orders. These monks were dedicated to the *vita Apostolica* with its emphasis on poverty and renunciation of personal or communal ownership. Thus, unlike the Benedictine form of monastic life, the mendicant friars were highly mobile, though they still had the same liturgical burdens of other monks, including recitation of the office. Therefore, the friars required a text for the office that was as brief as possible. Pope Innocent III had already abbreviated the Roman office for use by ecclesiastical officials at the Papal court, ca. 1213, and Francis of Assisi was persuaded to adopt this form of the liturgy by Cardinal Hugolin (later Pope Gregory IX), with the exception that the Franciscans would use the Gallican psalter.[52] Because of its abbreviated nature, the new book was referred to as a breviary.[53] The breviary collected all of the books previously necessary for the full celebration of the office under a single

[48] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 21.
[49] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 233.
[50] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 205-6.
[51] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, and Senn, *Christian Worship*, 205-6.
[52] Cassian Folsom, 'Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite' in Anscar J. Chupungo (ed.) *HLS I* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 287-8.
[53] We should, however, be careful to distinguish between the various types of breviaries. There were those breviaries intended for use in choir, which were still rather large items, and those of comparatively smaller size for personal and private use, which could be carried on a journey.

cover, in part by shortening familiar texts to only the first few words as a prompt to say the remainder from memory. Prior to the development of a breviary, a complete celebration of the office would have required a Psalter, antiphonal, hymnal, collector, Bible with Old and New Testaments, patristic and hagiographical texts, in addition to texts providing the fixed portions of the hours themselves. Obviously, the large number of books proved to be cumbersome to carry about, hence the success of the breviary among the Franciscans and other clergy who were becoming accustomed to celebrating the office privately.

The emergence of Humanism, and the Reformation era, both with their methodological principal, *ad fontes*, brought about significant changes to the form of the office in the West, specifically the shape of the breviary, just as it did for the missal. The Spanish Cardinal Francis Quiñones was commissioned by Pope Clement VII to reform the breviary. This particular form of the hours officially presumed the private recitation of the breviary was normative and the choral form as an aberration.[54] The new breviary distributed the psalms evenly across the hours and provided Matins fused with Lauds and centred on three lessons. The breviary also lacked most of the responses, antiphons, and severely shortened the sanctoral cycle in order to allow the office to be celebrated with as few interruptions as possible.[55] However, this breviary was only used for a short time and was quickly swept away by Pius V, following the demand of the Council of Trent to reform the breviary yet again. Pius' breviary, promulgated by decree in 1568, returned to the monastic offices common in the Roman basiclicas. The new breviary suppressed local rites which could not demonstrate constant use for more than two centuries, as with the missal, and the calendars of missal and breviary were harmonised and, like the missal that would eventually accompany it, the Tridentine breviary came to dominate the Western church. Still, Quiñones' reforms were not totally set aside as the new breviary calendar had pruned back the number of saints days, with 157 days listed as ferias in the 1568 breviary.[56] While still officially envisioned as a choir office, the liturgy of the hours had receded into the domain of clergy and religious as new societies, most notably the

[54] Senn, *Christian Worship*, 387
[55] Ibid., 387.
[56] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 22.

Society of Jesus, were constitutionally freed from common recitation of the office.[57] There would be further reforms of the breviary, notably under Urban VIII, where the office's hymnody was revised in the 1632 to increase conformity with (supposedly) superior classical verse, thus creating thousands of minor changes,[58] and again in 1911 with Pius X redistribution of the Psalter resulting in what Taft calls 'the most shocking departure from almost universal Christian tradition'.[59]

The situation progressed somewhat differently in the Reformation Churches. In addition to modifying the missal, Luther also modified the hours, where he (incorrectly) concluded that the original form of the office had been the lessons and not the repetition *ad naseum* of a few psalms assigned to the common of saints, due to the overgrown sanctoral cycle.[60] Over this, Luther inserted a sermon into the office. Like his reform of the eucharistic liturgy, Thomas Cranmer used the offices in the Sarum use as the basic material for his reform. But Cranmer also embraced several principals expressed by Quiñones, notably that the Psalter and lessons be read in sequence (*lectio continua*), in addition to pruning back the sanctoral cycle and reducing the number of saints legends to make room for more scriptural readings.[61] Furthermore, the hours themselves were reduced. Formalising the medieval custom of saying Matins, Lauds and Prime jointly, with Vespers and Compline also prayed together, Cranmer fused the three morning offices into a single liturgy called Matins and similarly merged Vespers and Compline to form Evensong.[62] But the singular contribution of Cranmer to the office is that Matins and Evensong remained a living part of parish life, something which cannot be said for the Roman Catholic office or the office in the Lutheran Church.[63] Substantively, the

---

[57] Joseph E. Weiss, 'Jesuits and the Liturgy of the Hours', (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1992), 138. The possibility of common recitation was not prohibited, but was definitely ruled out as the normative form for celebrating the office among the Society of Jesus.

[58] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 45. Urban, himself a poet, was not the only one dissatisfied with the quality of liturgical Latin, as many humanist clergy before him shared a disdain for the 'doggerel' quality of Latin liturgical poetry (Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 310).

[59] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 312. Specifically, he is referring to Pius' suppression Pss 148-50 at Lauds daily (substituted for one thanksgiving psalm per day, varying by the day) and the elimination of canticles except at Lent, in addition to several other changes which removed the cathedral elements from the main hours.

[60] Philip H. Pfatteicher, *Commentary on the Lutheran Book of Worship*, 347.

[61] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 323-4

[62] Pfatteicher, *Commentary on the Lutheran Book of Worship*, 348.

[63] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 323

offices for Matins and Vespers consist of the same fixed elements, variety provided by the appointed canticle, psalm, lessons, and collect.

Vatican II directly addressed the issue of the breviary, specifically stating that laity should be encouraged to participate in the office, in common or privately, which has thus far failed to take place.[64] This is perhaps to be expected as the *Consillium*, while referring to lay celebration of the hours, nevertheless treats the practical needs of religious and clergy almost exclusively,[65] creating a rite that is every bit as monastic as it was before the council.[66] Beyond Roman Catholics, Lutherans have enjoyed a bit more success in producing a liturgy more akin to the older cathedral rites in the forms for Vespers in both the *Lutheran Book of Worship* and *Lutheran Worship* as well as the 1979 American *BCP*. [67] The new offices in the 1979 American *BCP* remain substantively the same as they had been, though Compline is restored, and *Nunc dimittis* is returned to Compline from Vespers, and a noonday prayer is appointed as a small restoration of the minor hours.[68]

There are three texts for the Western Rite divine office: the *SASB*, which contains forms for morning and evening prayer, though without any propers; *Brevarium Monasticum*, which arranges the psalter according to the Benedictine form, but is otherwise not available as a Western Rite Orthodox publication;[69] and *The English Office*, which contains the forms for Morning and Evening Prayer in the 1928 American *BCP*.[70] Additionally, the *Missal for Use of Orthodox* contains the ordinary for Prime, Vespers, and Compline, though only in the ordinary form with no further references for

---

[64] Elisa E. Ugarte, 'The Participation of the Laity in the Liturgy of the Hours: The Reform that Failed' (J.C.L. thesis, Catholic University of America, 2004), 54.
[65] Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. §83-§101. *Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 163-7.
[66] White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 148-9.
[67] Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 326.
[68] However, a form for Compline was already provided in *A Book of Offices*, itself published by the Episcopal Church in 1914, and was used during the same period.
[69] That is, the form of *Brevarium Monasticum* used is that published within the Roman Catholic Church prior to the 1960's. As such, it is an unedited version of the text. Lancelot Andrewes Press does offer a two volume set, *Monastic Breviary Matins* and *The Monastic Diurnal*, though both items are reprints of earlier Anglo-Catholic volumes which supplemented the 1928 American *BCP* according to the Rule of St Benedict, but it is not a reprint of *Brevarium Monasticum* as such.
[70] Because these offices are drawn from the same source as TIK, they are sometimes referred to as the Tikhonite offices.

the propers. As the Tikhonite offices have received the most widespread publication by Western Rite Orthodox entities, our attention will focus on the text of those liturgies.

The *RO* do not provide need for extensive revision in the text of the prayerbook office, but concludes that

> There is nothing in the actual contents of "Daily Morning and Evening Prayer," together with the collects, which change according to the season, which is open to any particular objection on the positive side from the Orthodox point of view, unless the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed is taken into account. But at the same time, while the recourse in prayer to the Most Holy Mother of God, to the Angel Hosts, and to the illustrious saints, the glorification and invocation of them, forms an essential part of Orthodox and Catholic worship, these things are entirely foreign to Anglican worship. It is absolutely necessary that there should be introduced into this worship some such prayers (or hymns) in one or another form and degree.[71]

The 1928 American *BCP* did make alterations to the morning and evening prayer rites, but nothing which would specifically address the concerns set forward in the *RO*.

As there is no substantive variation between the 1928 American *BCP* and *The English Office*, we will concentrate primarily on the forms provide in the *SASB*. Both the *SASB* and *The English Office* omit the opening sentences and the confession, and both proceed immediately to the versicle 'Open my lips' and then onward to *Venite*. This is certainly a desirable change since the penitential element in Matins, as it was out of place with respect to the historic shape of the Western office, which assigned penitential elements to Vespers and Compline, when they were provided at all.[72] In this regard, the Western rite have moved further than the 1979 American *BCP*, which retains the penitential rite before Matins in Rite Two as an option and keeps the opening sentences of scripture as an alternative to the traditional versicle. In both Western rite forms, *Venite* is extended to the conclusion of Ps. 95, as is done in the Benedictine and Roman forms of the office. The *SASB* also omits *Benedictus es, Domine* before the second lesson and *Jubilate Deo* before the creed. The Lord's Prayer is also moved to after the Creed, rather than at its place at the opening of the office and the *SASB* omits the collects at the end of Matins.

---

[71] *RO*, 30

[72] Pfatteicher, *Commentary on the Lutheran Book of Worship*, 345.

The order for Vespers in the Western rite follows much the same pattern: the opening sentences and the confession are both omitted, as is the *Gloria* before the first lesson, and like with Matins, the Lord's Prayer is moved to immediately after the Creed. The *SASB* also omits the fixed psalm between the first and second lessons (either Ps. 95/94 or 98/97) and between the second lesson and the Creed (either Ps. 68/67 or 104/103). The responsorial prayer following the creed is also omitted and the collects that are retained are moved to the separate collector, except the Collect for Peace and the Prayer of St John Chrysostom, both of which are retained in the ordinary. The only significant addition that is made to either form of prayer, Matins or Vespers, is a brief prayer in the *SASB* invoking the Theotokos and the saints (with Joseph, Peter, Paul and Andrew mentioned by name); the same prayer is not included in *The English Office*. One final word about the Psalter deserves mention: in both *The English Office* and the *SASB*, the Masoretic numbering for the psalms has been retained. This is a minor point in itself, but one which deserves mention since the Orthodox Church utilises the Septuagint form of the Psalter, and the different numbering across rite is an unnecessary source of potential confusion.

The collector is an unique feature of the *SASB*; while *The English Office* offers the possibility of a collector, it does not actually provide one, 'because they are the responsibility of the leader in public worship and further a wider selection provides opportunity for the enrichment desired by the Decision of 1905 [sic]'.[73] However, no specific source for the necessary collects is supplied by statute or inference; presumably, *Brevarium Monasticum* would serve as a resource, and this may have been the editor's presupposition. The *SASB* collector is wholly dissimilar from that in the 1928 American *BCP*; whereas the *BCP* has a number of collects suitable for various occasions, though admittedly none for commemorating an individual saint or feast; the *SASB* has stricken most of the collects in the *BCP*, retaining only four collects: one for a sick adult and a collect for a child, and two collects of thanksgiving for recovery from sickness, again as forms for adults and children. A few other collects in the *SASB* are drawn from Western sources, primarily the 1963 edition of the *Monastic Diurnal*. The remaining collects, which constitutes the majority, are drawn from the Byzantine rite.

[73] AWRV, *The English Office* (Stanton: St Luke's Priory Press, 1989), vii.

The question remains of how well the office fulfils the requirements set forth in the *RO*. In terms of the ordinary itself, it is at least worthwhile to wonder if the pre-existing text was adequate. The positive evaluation of the office by *RO* should be taken at face value, particularly since what was desired was an enrichment of the office and not any structural change. The ordinary of the Benedictine and Roman forms of the office similarly lack direct invocation of the saints; rather, invocation of the saints is found in the propers which make up the variable structure of the office. In other words, there should be nothing which is objectionable in the *BCP* offices insofar as they represent the basic outline which is to be filled in with proper material. The more difficult part of the question is therefore the nature of the additions to the office which have been made. With regards to *The English Office*, we are actually left with very little to work with, given the lack of propers in the actual text. Therefore, we are again best served by considering the *SASB*.

With the *SASB*, there is certainly enthusiastic adaptation of the *RO*'s requirements regarding prayers to the saints. Of the prayers which do not address a specific need (such as sickness) or a specific occasion (such as entering a Church), only one-fifth of the collects in the *SASB* collector are addressed to or mention the Theotokos or one of the saints. However, what is problematic is the source of these prayers: with one exception (the *Angelus*), the prayers are drawn from the Byzantine rite and do not conform to the general style for collects in the Western Church. While this may not be a problem taken abstractly, it does present a problem for publically celebrating the Office. The collect is a very specific, tightly constructed prayer form with a rhythmic prose, resulting in what might be likened to a liturgical haiku. As the offices in the *BCP* conclude with the recitation of collects for various purposes, creating a particular tempo at the conclusion of the office; with twenty-five of the thirty-seven available collects drawn from Eastern sources, a significant change to office's natural cadence is bound to occur. Theologically, there is nothing improper about the collects, but it certainly seems that more care is necessary in choosing Eastern rite prayers to include in the office, and thought provided to shaping those prayers to conform to the general prayerforms in the West. Furthermore, the reduction of collects for needs is problematic as well, particularly since it presents the

celebrant fewer options for the needs of a community rather than increasing them, thus representing an impoverishment where the *RO* specifically sought enrichment.

Conclusions

The eucharistic liturgy has received a great deal of attention, both in scholarly literature and in Western Rite Orthodoxy's own discussion about the nature and meaning of the Western rite. Areas related to the eucharistic liturgy, like the calendar and the lectionary, have received less comment and as a result there has been little development in these items; the same is true of the Daily Office, which seems to have suffered unreasonable neglect given the *RO* comments on the office in the American *BCP* and the important canonical place the office has for the clergy. Unfortunately, as we will see, this situation is not unique, as other elements of the Western rite have similarly passed over into Orthodoxy without full consideration of potential difficulties they may create. Of course, there is really nothing objectionable about the lectionary in itself since no one would want to object to the reading of scripture. Likewise, the calendar has been thoroughly expunged of references to non-Orthodox saints, but it has not been enriched with greater addition of Eastern saints. This is ironic considering the inclusion of a greater number of non-Roman saints in the Catholic Church's General Calendar following Vatican II. Likewise, the Office itself contains little that can be considered objectionable, but it does lack the enrichments that the *RO* required, especially with the invocation of the saints. The answers that Western Rite Orthodox have provided in this instance, by metaphorically eviscerating the collector, do not seem at all satisfactory or even necessary; in some ways, the Daily Office is a tragedy for Western Rite Orthodoxy which does not seem to be heading for correction any time soon.

CHAPTER 8
THE OCCASIONAL LITURGIES

Having considered the primary sacramental liturgy, the Eucharist, and its associated issues, as well as those inherent in the sanctification of time, we can now turn our attention to the occasional liturgies of Western Rite Orthodoxy. These liturgies are used for celebrating the other sacraments and, as the name implies, are celebrated on particular occasions rather than on a regular basis. It is these occasional liturgies which make up the final portion of the official liturgical texts necessary for the Western rite and, while it is possible to investigate the other pious devotions of the faithful celebrated in common or in private, space is insufficient to consider them in detail.

The occasional services are not found in *TOM*. Rather, they are in a separate volume entitled *TOR*, which is exclusively concerned with the occasional services. Additionally, all the occasional liturgies are found in the *SASB*. For the most part, these liturgies are taken from the Roman rite rather than the 1928 American *BCP*, and the current form of these individual services reflects that common origin, either directly from *Rituale Romanum* or the Anglo-Catholic *The English Ritual*. However, because there are significant differences between the *SASB* and *TOR*, we will refer to both volumes throughout the course of the chapter.

The Ordinal

It is impossible to speak of a liturgy of ordination for Western Rite Orthodoxy because such a rite does not exist. At the present time, particularly within the AWRV, all ordinations to all orders are performed using the Byzantine liturgy for ordination. In all likelihood, this is a result of there being no bishops within the AWRV who celebrate the Western rite, and thus there is no way to celebrate the liturgy of ordination according to

the Western rite.[1] In looking through back issues of *Orthodoxy*, there are photographs of ordinations after the issuing of the *Western Rite Edict* which clearly shows clergy being ordained and vested in the Byzantine rite, and without the presence of an ordinal in any approved service book of the AWRV, there is no reason to think that this practice has changed.[2]

Christian Initiation

The next of the sacraments, which will be referred to as Christian Initiation, are actually three sacraments which are celebrated simultaneously: Baptism, Confirmation, and first Communion.[3] They are discussed together because in Western Rite Orthodoxy, as in the Byzantine rite, the two ceremonies are joined into a single initiation rite. Historically, Baptism and Confirmation were administered together in the Western Church, but as churches moved from urban to rural areas, the two rites were separated since it was customary in the West for the bishop alone to administer the post-baptismal anointing.

As there are a number of histories of the rites of Christian Initiation which are commonly available and it is beyond the scope of the current work to treat this history in

[1] That is not to say that bishops who have Western rite clergy do not preside over the liturgy of those parishes when making a pastoral visit, rather that they do not celebrate the Eucharist according using the Western rite. We will take up the question of potential difficulties for Western Rite Ortohdoxy in Chapter 11, but here it is sufficient to point out that the lack of a Western ordinal is possibly due to the fact that all Antiochian hierarchs are present at a Western rite liturgy as non-celebrating hierarchs whereas the Western ordinal requires that the bishop celebrate the Eucharist at ordination with the newly ordained concelebrating.

[2] And, in personal conversations with Fr. Paul Schneirla, he has informed me that clergy are exclusively ordained according to the Byzantine rite, with the possible exception that those ordained into minor orders (subdiaconate and below) might possibly be ordained according to the Western rite, though precisely what text of the rite is used is not entirely clear.

[3] A word of clarification is no doubt in order here. When using the word 'confirmation,' I mean the Western liturgy where the chrism is administered with laying on of hands and prayer for the Holy Spirit, regardless of whether it is administered by an Orthodox priest or non-Orthodox Western bishop. By contrast, 'chrismation' references the Byzantine rite of the same purpose but administered by the priest as a part of the baptismal rite. The anointing performed by the priest in the Roman rite (and other ancient or non-Orthodox rites) is referred to either as presbyterial anointing or post-baptismal anointing. Furthermore, the primary emphasis of Chrismation in the East is on the gift of the Holy Spirit; while Holy Spirit language is present in Confirmation, the text often suggests an additional gift of or strengthening of the gift of the Holy Spirit that was given in baptism. The Western post-baptismal anointing is not associated with the giving of the Holy Spirit at all.

depth, only the broadest outlines are sketched here.[4] The earliest source for rite of Baptism comes from the *Didache*, which describes the preferred type of water, the method of administration, and adds the requirement that those who give and receive baptism fast 'a day or two' before the rite. It is assumed the preceding chapters formed a proto-catechetical manual,[5] but there are no references to who administers the baptism, the appropriate age of the candidate, or description of any ancillary ceremonies, such as pre- or post-baptismal anointing. Justin Martyr in *First Apology* is similarly vague except on the actual administration of water; the primary benefit of this text is that it provides an interpretation of the baptismal rite, the earliest we possess. From North Africa, in the writings of Tertullian, we see evidence for the use and blessing of a bath rather than the use of 'living' or running water as in *Didache*, as well as references to 'frequent prayer, fastings, bending the knee, all-night vigils and confession of sins' and renunciation of the devil.[6] Problematic for even a short summary of the history of Christian baptism, especially one with specific consideration for the practice of the West if one includes *The Apostolic Tradition*, the authorship and authenticity of which is disputed.[7] Thus our earliest reliable evidence for the Western customs related to baptism would be John the Deacon in the sixth century.[8]

In the fourth and fifth century, we begin to see rites which are similar to the liturgies that are currently used in East and West, with emphasis on an increasing number of exorcisms or 'scrutinies' spaced out over a period of several weeks in what becomes Lent.[9] By the sixth century, the rite in both East and West had begun to collapse so that the pre-baptismal actions (previously set over a space of several weeks) were now celebrated immediately before the actual water bath, with a space of only a few days or, as became increasingly frequent, a few moments. The shift to a telescoped pre-baptismal

---

[4] Peter Cramer *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200 – c. 1150* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1993); Peter J. Jagger, *Christian Initiation 1552-1969: Rites of Baptism and Confirmation Since the Reformation Period* (London: SPCK, 1970); Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press 2007); and Aidan Kavanagh *The Shape of Baptism*; Spinks *Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978).

[5] Cf. Milavec *The Didache*, 253ff; some scholars have argued that the entirety of the preceding chapters, sometimes called The Two Ways, was recited immediately before the baptism itself

[6] Spinks, *Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism*, 31.

[7] See Chapter 4 n.9.

[8] Johnson, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 165 ff.

[9] Cf. Johnson, 'From Three Weeks to Forty Days', *SL* 20.2 (1990) 185-200.

rite was primarily the result of demographic changes to the subjects of the initiation rites, with fewer and fewer adults converting to Christianity and more and more infants being presented for baptism. The post-baptismal anointing remained the liturgy, but in the West a second anointing by the bishop following baptism (either immediately or with a progressively increasing space of time) spread beyond Rome and into parts of Gaul, beginning the development of the separate ceremony now known as Confirmation. However, despite this telescoping on the part of the liturgy, the actual structures of the liturgy do not radically change and would remain more or less fixed in the Western Church until Vatican II, when the initiation liturgy was again expanded over a series of weeks in Lent for adult candidates.

The current practice of Western Rite Orthodox is a continuation of the Tridentine initiation in that the liturgy is virtually identical with the Tridentine rite's baptismal liturgy, with the exception that the presbyterial anointing at the conclusion of the rite has been replaced with the bishops prayer at Confirmation from the Tridentine rite, though it continues to be assigned to the priest. Additionally, Ps. 99/98 and 22/21 are omitted from the rite after the second scrutiny when the priest leads the catechumen to the font. Furthermore, the Apostles' Creed has been replaced with the Nicene Creed as is customary in the Byzantine rite. The liturgy contains absolutely no similarity to the baptismal liturgy in any *BCP*. The 1928 American *BCP* liturgy provides both an exhortation to the candidate and a Gospel lesson prior to the baptism, along with a bidding prayer and reception of the neophyte by the priest on behalf of the whole church. All of these elements are wholly absent from the rite as it was in *TOR* and the *SASB*. Indeed, there is no expression in either the *SASB* or *TOR* that baptism should be performed as an act of the entire community so that baptism is essentially a private affair for the child, their parents, and the godparents.[10]

TOR contains more preliminary rubrics, including the requirement that a metal baptismal shell or a ladle is provided for the administration of water, with the assumption that pouring will be the primary method of administering the sacrament, while later

[10] The rubrics of *TOR* do not explicitly forbid a public celebration, nor do those of the *SASB*. However, the rubrics do not provide instructions for where the rite should be inserted into the Sunday eucahristic liturgy, except for during the Paschal Vigil where the form of the liturgy provides a natural point for administering baptism; thus, a private celebration is presumed.

rubrics imply the administration will be by immersion.[11] This is in contrast to the *SASB*, which requires that the administration be by immersion exclusively.[12] *TOR* requires the priest to ascertain the child's gender and insure that 'improper, notorious, or ridiculous names shall not be imposed.'[13] *TOR* also omits the consecration of the Oil of Catechumens and the associated prayer for illumination for a new catechumen in the baptismal liturgy, though and the exorcism and blessing of the baptismal water are included as an appendix to the baptismal rite. Both texts are found directly within the *SASB*. Textually, the only other difference between the two rites is that the *SASB* adds 'which was given and shed for thee' to the administration of the reserved sacrament following chrismation.

As a rite, the baptismal liturgy contained in the Tridentine books has undergone a long period of development.[14] However, in terms of the ritual text, the Roman baptismal liturgy has remained relatively stable, with only minor rubrical or formulaic variations from place to place, as it was adopted across Western Europe and as the subjects of baptism changed from adult catechumens to infants, and baptism ceased to be celebrated exclusively on 'baptismal festivals' like Easter or Pentecost but was administered on an 'as needed' basis. In these two respects, the Byzantine baptismal liturgy has experienced similar developments. In terms of their essential actions, there is little difference between the Western and Byzantine rites of initiation. Both still contain the form for making the individual a catechumen, even though in the case of infant baptism there is no period of instruction. As the ritual structure for both liturgies is the same in terms of actions even down to detail, and the text of the two rites are similar, even complementary, there is little theologically that should be objected to in the Western baptismal rite up to the conclusion of the water bath. The significant difference between Western rite's initiation liturgy and those of the Christian East are primarily related to the place of the anointing which takes place after the water bath. In the East, this second anointing is the Sacrament of Chrismation, whereas in the West the anointing is a supplementary act to baptism

[11] AWRV, *TOR*, 13 §20.
[12] Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 159.
[13] *TOR*, 4.
[14] Cf. Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation*; Adrien Nocent 'Christian Initiation in the Roman church from the Fifth Century Until Vatican II' in Chupungco (ed.) *HLS* IV, 49-90; and Schmemann *Of Water and the Spirit: A Liturgical Study of Baptism* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974).

which is itself invested with no sacramental significance. The nearest equivalent is the Western Sacrament of Confirmation, though even here the similarities are primarily related to the use of oil and otherwise longstanding anecdotal association between the two actions.[15]

On the other hand, the Western rite liturgy for confirmation has been created by removing the presbyteral anointing with chrism after baptism and replacing it with the prayers of confirmation by a bishop. This creates some oddities within the rite itself, most notably the prayer that asks that the neophyte be 'replenished' with the Spirit.[16] More importantly, the actual formula for the anointing with chrism still has the language of juridical confirmation with the priest stating that he 'confirms' the individual anointed. Of course, the only reason why the language of confirming enters into the chrismatory rite at all is because the hand-laying by the bishop (and, subsequently, the anointing) was intended to validate or 'confirm' what the presbyters had done in their absence, thus completing the initiatory rite.[17] However, in the Orthodox Western rite, the priest is the normal minister of the sacrament and, as such, there is no specific need for anything to be confirmed at all. To include the language of 'confirm' is merely to introduce a formula that is contradictory to the theology and liturgical life that is otherwise normative in Orthodoxy. Since the anointing also includes 'the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit' it would have been better to eliminate the language of confirming and the Trinitarian invocation and simply leave the above formula which more clearly expresses what Orthodox Christians believe the post-baptismal anointing accomplishes. While it is true that it would be an example of creeping Byzantinisation of the liturgy, specifically by removing a formula historically attested to in the ancient West in favour of something from the Byzantine rite, in this case there seems to be no preferable solution because the theology of Western confirmation and Eastern chrismation are so radically different that

[15] Several studies usually relate that the Western sacrament of Confirmation is distinct from and was originally sheared off of the baptismal rite: see Gerard Austin, *Anointing with the Spirit*. However, for other perspectives on the origin of confirmation as distinct from the post-baptismal anointing (and the perspective which is followed in this study), see Gabriele Winkler, 'Confirmation or Chrismation?', *Worship* 58.1 (1984) 2-17.

[16] Being that this is only moments after the baptism of the candidate, one wonders how quickly the Spirit flows out of the neophyte that they already need to be replenished.

[17] Winkler, 'Confirmation or Chrismation?', *Worship* 58.1 (1984) 12-3.

there can be little reconciliation between them, especially in the context of substituting the form of confirmation for that of the presbyteral anointing.[18]

The retention of the blow (the *alapa* or the so-called 'pat of peace,' which is a gentle strike on the cheek of the recipient of the sacrament by the minster) when the presbyter exchanges the peace with the newly confirmed is an unfortunate circumstance for the specific imagery that it provides. Historically, the *alapa* has been interpreted as a sign of the struggles that the newly confirmed would face as a 'soldier of Christ'.[19] The violence of *alapa* is appropriate if the rite is to emphasize strengthening of the baptismal gift that was imparted long ago, but 'the occurrence of military imagery, with its "defensive" connotations, in the post-baptismal rite, tends to reduce the gift of the Spirit to the effect of strengthening.'[20] Likewise, the prayer for the seven-fold gifts of the Holy Spirit is problematic from the perspective of Orthodox theology as seen in the Byzantine rite. Specifically, the focus of the sacrament is not the strengthening of the neophyte for battle (for this has taken place in the pre-baptismal rites) or to receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but rather the Holy Spirit himself, as Schmemann observes,

> …if the specific purpose of Chrismation were the bestowing of any particular 'gifts' of 'grace' necessary for man's preservation in Christian life (which grace in faith is bestowed in Baptism, the sacrament of regeneration and illumination), the formula would have been in the plural. And if it is not, it is precisely because the newness and the radical uniqueness of this sacrament is that it bestows on man not any particular gift or gifts of the Holy Spirit, *but the Holy Spirit himself as gift*.[21]

That being considered, it would actually be more correct, and indeed entirely preferable, if the language regarding replenishment of the Spirit and confirming what was done in the Baptismal rite were removed. Certainly, if a consistently expressed baptismal rite is

[18] This is certainly one instance where it would have been immanently preferable to leave the text more or less as it was. The text still would have needed addition to introduce the idea of the anointing as providing the gift of the Holy Spirit, but the remainder of the formula is certainly appropriate for a post-baptismal anointing, especially in that the prayer includes allusions to the baptized sharing in Christ's nature by sharing in his anointed nature, much as the West Syrian rite (which partly shaped the Byzantine rite) did historically.
[19] Johnson, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 255.
[20] Winkler, 'Confirmation or Christmation?', *Worship* 58.1 (1984) 15.
[21] Schmemann, *Of Water and Spirit*, 79, emphasis original.

not desirable because of desires to retain the historic Western formula for confirmation, the Orthodox theology of the baptismal rite should at least be given due consideration.[22]

However, it is worth considering the point regarding the retention of the western formula of confirmation. Even if it is demonstrated that retaining the formula is undesirable as a part of the baptismal liturgy, what of retaining confirmation as a separate ceremony, not as a sacrament (since chrismation would and should continue to be administered immediately as a part of the baptismal rite) but as a pastoral ministry of the bishop to adolescents in the Western rite? Of importance is whether it is really essential to Orthodoxy to administer confirmation at the time of baptism and, if so, whether doing so does any sort of violence to the Western form of initiation. We know that presbyterial confirmation took place in Gaul up until the Carolingian reforms[23] and that it took place in the Roman West in the fourth century. But at the same time, we also know that the Roman practice of restricting the post-baptismal anointing to the bishop is also early. Pope Innocent I states that

> Regarding the signing of infants, this clearly cannot be done validly by anyone other than the Bishop. For even though presbyters are priests, none of them holds the office of pontiff. For not only is it ecclesiastical custom that shows this should be done only by pontiffs – in other words, that they alone would sign or give the comforting Spirit – but there is also the reading in the Acts of the Apostles….For whether the bishop is present or not, presbyters are allowed to anoint the baptized with chrism. But they are not allowed to sign the forehead with the same oil consecrated by the Bishop, for that is used by the bishops only when they give the Spirit, the paraclete.[24]

Could confirmation in the historic Western pattern of administration by a bishop, but as a distinct rite from confirmation/chrismation, continue to be administered in the pattern of the Roman rite and most of the West for the last millennia? At least in abstract, there is no specific reason why this would not be acceptable, though there are certainly practical

[22] And indeed Western theology. Even as these developments in the confirmatory rite progressed, commentators into the twelfth century and later continued to insist that that confirmation is most appropriately administered to an infant and indeed that parents should not delay bringing their infant to the bishop unduly (cf. for example Robertus Pullus, *Sententiae* 5.23, *PL* 186, 847 and Peter of Poitiers *Sententiae* 5:9, *PL* 211, 1241). Several synods in the thirteenth century imposed severe penalties for parents who were negligent in bringing children to be confirmed past the ages of one (Worchester 1240), five (Richard Poore, *Constitutions*, ca. 1217), seven (Liège, 1287), or even as late as ten (Cologne, 1280).

[23] Cf. Winkler, 'Confirmation or Chrismation?', *Worship* 58.1 (1984), 2-17.

[24] Innocent I, *Epistola* XXV (*ad Decentio episcopo*) III, *PL* 20, 554-5.

problems which would need to be overcome. Indeed, if in the historic Western rite the episcopal confirmation is something which is added to the baptismal liturgy at a later date rather than the separation of the chrismatory ceremony from baptism as is often suggested, then there may be even more reason to revive the confirmation liturgy, even in Western Rite Orthodoxy.[25] However, there are problems associated with episcopal confirmation is what the participation of the bishop as the primary (or even sole) minister of confirmation says about baptism. Winkler points out that the original purpose of confirmation was to 'confirm' what the priest had done in baptism: 'In general, [evidence from the synods of south Gaul] from the mid-fifth century seems to indicate that *confirmatio* developed in the context of juridical issues concerning the post-baptismal rite and the office of bishop….this episcopal function was characterized, however, as one of 'confirmation': *neophyte si fuerint ab ipso confirmentur*.'[26] Thus, episcopal confirmation, even if not originally part of the baptismal liturgy could imply inferiority or insufficiency in the presbyteral baptismal rite and the presbyteral post-baptismal anointing: the bishop is required to attest that baptismal rite is legitimate, hence his participation by anointing the neophyte.[27]

The elimination of the episcopal confirmation is therefore one instance where the resulting change is not only adequate, but desirable in part because of what episcopal confirmation can be understood as saying about the presbyterial baptism. By emphasizing that the post-baptismal anointing by the priest is confirmation, it even enacts a reform which is viewed as desirable by some within the non-Orthodox West.[28] It is unfortunate that the two formulas (Eastern and Western) for confirmation have been spliced together in a clumsy way. It would have been imminently better to eliminate the Western Confirmation formula entirely, for the reasons which are noted above and has been done

[25] For a more extensive discussion on episcopal confirmation as a distinct action unrelated to the initiation rite, see Kavanagh, 'Confirmation: A Suggestion from Structure', *Worship* 58.5 (1984) 386-95; Frank C. Quinn, 'Confirmation Reconsidered: Rite and Meaning', *Worship* 59.4 (1985) 354-70; Paul Turner, 'The Origins of Confirmation: An Analysis of Aidan Kavanagh's Hypothesis', *Worship* 65.4 (1991) 320-36.
[26] Winkler, 'Confirmation or Chrismation?' *Worship* 58.1 (1984) 12.
[27] The counter-argument would of course be that the bishop does indeed participate in the chrismation, though vicariously through consecrating the chrism and distributing it to the priests. One is nevertheless left to wonder, in light of the current Orthodox practice of reserving the consecration of chrism to the primate rather than the diocesan, how exactly the local bishop does in fact participate in the chrismation of each neophyte.
[28] Cf. Schmemann, *Of Water and the Spirit*, 115-21.

in the reformed rites of baptism in the Roman Catholic Church. An equally simple solution would have been to simply replace the formula in the post-baptismal anointing with 'the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit' rather than adding confusion by the implicit statement that Western confirmation and Eastern chrismation are the same thing.

Continuing with the reformed rites in the Roman Catholic Church, there is something worthwhile to say about the new rite's assumptions that the baptism liturgy will take place during the Sunday Eucharist, not the least of which is that it preserves the connection between baptism and community and baptism and Pascha better than private baptism from the reserved sacrament as takes place in the current Western Orthodox baptismal rite,

> Indeed, [the neophyte's] entrance is first of all the act of joining the gathered community, the *Church* in the first and most literal sense of the Greek word ἐκκλησία, which means assembly, gathering. Their first experience of the Church is not that of an abstraction or idea, but that of a real and concrete unity of persons who, because each one of them is united to Christ, are united to one another, constitute one family, one body, one fellowship.[29]

This moving from the font to the prayers of the faithful is the more ancient practice for East and West. It would be desirable for the Western Rite Orthodox to return to the more ancient practice over the medieval, not solely because it is more ancient, but because it is potentially more meaningful, not only for adult converts, but for the parents of newly baptized infants as well.

One final point which must be mentioned is the conclusion of the initiatory rite. Historically in both East and West, the neophyte would receive the Eucharist as the culmination of the sacraments of initiation. Justin Maryr describes how the newly baptized are taken directly into the eucharistic celebration without delay, admitting them to the communion immediately. This is still the practice in the Christian East, with even infants given communion either immediately from the reserved sacrament or at the next mass.[30] In the West, because of the delay for confirmation, the period of Christian initiation was expanded from a single instance of the several sacraments celebrated together into a process that spanned between ten and fifteen years by the Tridentine

[29] Schmemann, *Of Water and the Spirit*, 118, emphasis original.
[30] AWRV, *TOR*, 17-8, and Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 162.

period. Both the *SASB* and *TOR* provide for communion immediately following the baptismal rite from the reserved sacrament. Insofar as this restores the ancient pattern of Christian initiation (baptism, chrismation, Eucharist), the inclusion of the communion rite from the reserved sacrament is certainly a step in the proper direction, one which is also being discussed by other Western churches, however tentatively.[31] Simultaneously, this does not change the potential benefit of Western Rite Orthodoxy following the lead of the post-Vatican II West and restoring the initiation rite as a part of the public Sunday liturgy, rather than retaining the baptismal liturgy as a private ceremony for the candidate and his or her family.

Marriage

The marriage rite creates a unique challenge in the study of Western Rite Orthodoxy. Unlike the other sacraments, which are in and of themselves unique to the Church or are at the very least unique in purpose, marriage represents a common human estate, something not invented by the church but rather adapted and 'baptized' into its life.[32] In some sense, it is the action of the church lending approval in a sacred realm that which is already or simultaneously acknowledged as a civil reality. Early Christians, while they certainly married, did not develop any particular ceremony to unite a couple, but rather used the customs current in the places where they lived. Subsequent, specifically Christian liturgies retained elements of these pre-existing customs for betrothal and marriage, with rites celebrated today existing as a combination of the two ceremonies. In Rome, the betrothal was made by agreement on the terms of the engagement and concluding in a promise to marry between the two parties, the joining of hands of the betrothed, and the offering of a sign in pledge; the marriage itself consisted in the couple sharing of a wheat cake and a sacrifice to Jupiter, spreading a veil over both parties, and consummation of the marriage.[33] Among the Greeks, the betrothal and

[31] See e.g. The Episcopal Church, *Children at the Table: The Communion of All the Baptized in Anglicanism Today* (New York: Church Hymnal Corp., 1995).
[32] Leaving aside, of course, the parallels between Christian Initiation and the early Jewish ritual of the mikveh, for example. However, even here we could argue of the uniqueness of both action and intention since the mikveh is a frequently repeated ritual used to remove ritual purification following contact with objects or persons which are ritually terif rather than for the remission of sins and incorporation into the mystical body of Christ.
[33] Nocent, 'The Christian Rite of Marriage in the West' in Chupungco (ed.), *HLS* IV, 276-279.

marriage involved several rituals, including a formalized handshake between the bride's father and the groom, the presentation of the bride and groom to one another while wearing crowns, exchanging gifts, processions to the bridal chamber, sacrifices, and general festivity by the wedding party.[34]

Christians adopted pre-existing local customs and reinterpreted them with theological meaning, in addition to reassigning some of the father's roles to the priest. The process by which Christianity took over local customs and adapted the rituals to Christian understanding is well documented.[35] The first reference to the Church's role in marriage is from Ignatius of Antioch in *Letter to Polycarp* where he commends that those who wish to be married seek the approval of the bishop, but not because the bishop would join them together but so that all things might be done in accordance within the will of God.[36] Furthermore, there is no evidence of any sort of liturgical rite or blessing which is to be offered to the couple, at least not in this setting. Athenagoras of Athens states that there are specific rules within the Christian community for marriage.[37] Stevenson concludes that such rules would include a marriage liturgy,[38] but Athenagoras goes on to say that Christians marry 'like everyone else',[39] so there is no specific reason to assume there is a special Christian wedding ceremony in this period. Even John Chrysostom mentions providing the bride and groom with crowns as in the pagan Greek

---

[34] John H. Oakley and Rebecca H. Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 3-37.

[35] Peter Galadza, 'Marriage Rites in the Byzantine Tradition', *Liturgical Ministry* 5.1 (1996), 27-33; J. Meyendorff, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975); Nocent, 'The Christian Rite of Marriage in the West', in Chupungco (ed.), *HLS* IV, 275-301; Stefano Parenti 'The Christian Rite of Marriage in the East' in Chupungco (ed.), *HLS* IV, 255-74; David M. Petras, 'The Liturgical Theology of Marriage', *Diakonia* 16.3 (1981) 225-237; Philip L. Reynolds, *Marriage in the Western Church: The Christianization of Marriage During the Patristic and Early Medieval Periods* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994); Kenneth Stevenson *Nuptial Blessing: A Study of Christian Marriage Rites* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983) and *To Join Together: The Rite of Marriage* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1987); and Patrick Viscuso 'A Byzantine Theology of Marriage: The *Syntagma Kata Stoicheion* of Matthew Blastares' (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1988).

[36] Ignatios of Antioch, *Ad Polycarpum* V.2, *PG* 5, 723/4

[37] Athenagoras of Athens, *Legatio pro Christianis* XXXIII.1, *PG* 6, 965/6.

[38] Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing*, 14.

[39] Anon., *Epistula ad Diognetum* V.3, PG 2, 1173/4. (This epistle is anonymous in *PG*, but is identified with Athenagoras by Stevenson.) This could mean that Christians follow the same basic rituals as other peoples they live among in regards to marriage, though invoking the Christian god instead of other deities. Still, Stevenson concludes that such a statement means only that 'Christians are normal people, which respectable views on human life, which seems to be his purpose in this passage' (Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing*, 15). Depending on how one interprets Athenagoras' statement on the particular laws of Christian marriage (that is, whether such laws included a rite of marriage or not and these 'laws' are rules about marriage such as we see in the Pastoral Epistles and Matthew 6).

rites, though reinterpreting the crowns as crowns of victory for having overcome the passions of the flesh, with the not so subtle statement that those who have not overcome their passions should not be crowned at all.[40]

It took many centuries for the Church to assume the roles and functions previously assigned in local customs to family or civil officials. St Gregory the Theologian in the fourth century mentions that he wishes he had been at the marriage of a friend's children so as to provide his own blessing to the couple, but he implies that the blessing would have been distinct from the normal blessing given to the couple by the father.[41] This 'domestic' marriage form, either apart from or concurrent with the ecclesiastical form persisted in East and West for a number of centuries. Certainly, the Church had control over her adherents and could impose discipline and those who violated Christian norms for marriage, and could provide its own specific recognition and consent of a marriage by a rite of blessing, but marriage could also be a purely civil matter. It was not until the tenth century that Emperor Leo IV ruled that a marriage that had not been blessed by the Church was considered to be an illicit concubinage in the eyes of the state.[42] There were also contemporary attempts in the West at legislating the marriage ceremony out of the home and bring the marriage into the Church, though such programs were more effective in long Christianized regions than they were in the missionary areas like Scandinavia and Poland.

Meyendorff notes that the separation of the marital rite from the eucharistic liturgy is an innovation in the Eastern rite and a concession to political realities which necessitated the Church sanctioning second and third marriages during the imperial era, something forced on the Church by making it the legal arbiter of what was and was not a legitimate marriage through necessitating the marital blessing for the union to be recognized by the state.[43] Because some marriages did not conform to ordinary Christian discipline, either because they would be between prohibited classes, within prohibited degrees, or one or more of the parties had previously been married, the marriage liturgy was separated from the Eucharist to preserve something of the Church's discipline while

[40] John Chrysostom, *In 1 Tim*, *PG* 62, 546.
[41] Gregory the Theologian, *Epistola CCXXXIII* (*Ad Diocli)*, *PG* 37, 375/6.
[42] Meyendorff, *Marriage*, 26.
[43] Ibid., 27-30.

simultaneously conforming to its societal role. By contrast, the connexion between the eucharistic liturgy and the marriage liturgy is an innovation in the Christian West, though, the celebration of the marriage liturgy in domestic seeting seems to have co-existed with its celebration in church for a fairly long period of time.[44] Based on the ecclesiastical legislation condemning such practices, it would seem that couples were content to live with one another without seeking official sanction within the church, even as late as the turn of the first millennium.

The marriage rite as found in both *TOR* and the *SASB* comes from *The English Ritual*, which itself is a reproduction of the marriage rite in *Rituale Romanum*.[45] The 1614 edition of *Rituale Romanum* represents the beginning of an impoverishment to the marriage ritual as it provides only a minimal number of prayers and gestures for the liturgy. The Council of Trent specifically stated that customs in use in various places were to be retained, and thus the rite in *Rituale Romanum* is likely an outline containing that which was deemed necessary for lawfully celebrating the sacrament rather than a liturgy to be followed to the letter. This is certainly possible since the use of *Rituale Romanum* was not obligatory, unlike the use of the Missal and Breviary, [46] though it was certainly treated as a required text in most regions. The marriage liturgy of *Rituale Romanum*, both with and apart from the nuptial mass, begins with the couple coming to the church and declaring their individual consent before the priest. The two are subsequently joined in matrimony and rings are exchanged. The rite itself is concluded with a short responsorial prayer and a collect. In the Tridentine rite, the marriage liturgy would take place before the eucharistic liturgy and in the Mass of Paul IV, the marriage is moved to between the Gospel and the homily.[47] The former position for celebrating the marriage is retained by Western Rite Orthodox. At the conclusion of the eucharistic liturgy, between the dismissal and the Last Gospel, a series of collects were prayed over the bride for the future of the marriage.

---

[44] Stevenson, *To Join Together*, 36-9.
[45] *The English Ritual* in fact has two forms of the marriage rite, one from *Rituale Romanum* and the other from the 1928 American *BCP*. It is the first rite which is subsequently reproduced in precise detail by *TOR*.
[46] Mark Searle and Kenneth Stevenson, *Documents of the Marriage Liturgy* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 184-5.
[47]However, see Philip Weller (ed.), *The Roman Ritual* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1964), 268 §70. Here the rubrics of 1964 did require that the marriage rite be celebrated in the same place as in the Missal of Paul IV.

The marriage liturgy in *TOR* is fairly straightforward to compare with its source since it duplicates the first form of the rite from *The English Ritual* without any modification (even to the point of referencing *The English Missal* in the rubrics for celebrating the nuptial mass). The relationship between the marriage liturgy in the *SASB* and the 1928 American *BCP* is more complex since the former weaves together elements of the marriage rite from the prayerbook and *Rituale Romanum*. The primary elements adapted from the prayer book by *SASB* are included in the betrothal, specifically the exhortation at the beginning of the rite. However, it is the nuptial blessing which makes the rite truly unique, in that it is a combination of the blessing delivered apart from the eucharistic liturgy and the blessing as given as a part of the celebration of mass. This particular form is used both with and without the liturgy, with the Eucharist begins immediately after nuptial blessings.

At this point, one is inclined to question the wisdom of the *SASB* construction of the liturgy. The particular rendering of the liturgy is not especially skilful. The original structure of the rite in *Rituale Romanum* and the 1928 American *BCP* was that the betrothal and marriage would take place either in the nave or at the chancel and then would move to the altar for the nuptial blessing. A distinct lack of rubrics permeates the nuptial blessing, wherein no directions are provided as to where the blessing should actually take place. Within *TOR*, the blessing occurs after the communion has been distributed, but before the general blessing is pronounced on the faithful. For the *SASB*, there are two separate renderings of the nuptial blessing, and it is unclear where either of these two blessings should be placed within the scheme of the liturgy, except to say that first blessing occurs after the recitation of Ps. 128/127 and the second takes place sometime after the Gospel.

Within the *SASB*, there is no clear delineation of celebration of the marriage rite apart from the nuptial mass and the marriage rite celebrated with a mass. Rather, the elements of both versions are included together as a single, inclusive ceremony with little explanation or rubrics to direct the liturgy. While there is reference to the nuptial mass and to what one assumes are the introit, gradual, Epistle, and Gospel for nuptial mass, the *SASB* lacks direction on where to place remaining prayers over the couple should take place and without any direction as to the conclusion of the rite.

The actual text of the nuptial blessing differs wildly between the *SASB* and *TOR*. The *SASB* follows the translation of *The English Ritual* verbatim, using the prayer over the couple from the 1662 English *BCP*, while *TOR* follows *Rituale Romanum* for the prayer after Our Father in the marriage liturgy. The *SASB* also inserts two prayers from the 1662 *BCP* following the prayer over the couple. Interestingly, these prayers are not taken from *The Anglican Ritual*'s nuptial blessing, but from the section related to the celebration of the marriage rite according to the prayerbook. The *SASB* also displays one interesting progressive element in that it makes the prayer for the procreation of children an optional part of the rite to be used at the discretion of the priest. Going deeper into the nuptial blessing and comparing the text of the three forms, the *SASB* rite becomes even more curious. The actual blessing of the couple is 'The Lord God Almighty bless...,' rather than the familiar 'The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob be with you...' as in *Rituale Romanum* and *TOR*. The first prayer does appear in *TOR*, but it is the conclusion of the rite when the blessing is given outside of mass. This results in grave damage to the shape of the liturgy if and when the liturgy is celebrated together with the Eucharist because it separates the communion-blessing element longstanding within the Catholic West. However, by retaining 'The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' as the last prayer in the rite, it results in the confused situation where the marriage is not blessed once, but twice. The so-called Long Prayer ('O God, who by Thy mighty power has made things of nothing') in the *SASB* is somewhat more preferable to that in *TOR* in that it is a prayer for the couple, rather than a prayer exclusively over the bride, though both forms are found historically in the West.[48]

All of the confusion found within the rite of the *SASB* leads to the conclusion that the marriage rite has been hastily cobbled together from disparate sources without consideration to source or functionality in the celebration of the liturgy with the intention of providing as much material as possible for its own sake, or perhaps merely for the sake of 'completeness.' Problematically, such completeness actually removes some characteristics which have been common to the Western liturgy of marriage for several centuries, including provision to solemnise a marriage in the 'closed seasons' and other instances where an individual might legitimately be married in the Church but

[48] Cf. Stevenson, *To Join Together*, 36-9.

nevertheless be prohibited from receiving the nuptial blessing. As a result, the *SASB* creates an almost entirely new rite, at once continuous with the old and simultaneously forming a radical departure with the marital traditions of the West, in particular the Roman West, off which the rite is based, knowingly or unknowingly. The situation is not aided by *TOM* which lacks propers for the celebration of a nuptial mass. It would seem apparent that the editors of the *SASB*, whatever the nobility of their intentions, had absolutely no idea what they were doing on this point.

Differences between the Eastern and Western liturgies for marriage are bound to appear since they have grown from different cultural foundations. While some of these differences may be inconsequential, some of them are very much related to the theology that develops out of the rite. The most significant differences between the two liturgies are the use of vows between the couple in the Western rite and their absence in the East, the use of crowns in the Eastern rite and their absence in the West, and the priest placing the rings on the fingers of the couple during the betrothal in certain forms of the rite.[49] The act of crowning in the Byzantine rite is a unique element of the marriage liturgy which is not duplicated perceptibly in the Western rite. Nikephoros the Confessor states that those who enter into a second or third marriage are not to receive crowning and are to be excommunicated.[50] Here, the act of crowning and its accompanying blessing and, historically, the common reception of the Eeucharist, which is also prohibited by Nicephorus for second and third marriages, are the hinges of the act which constitute the sacrament of marriage.[51] Theodore the Studite also defends the practice of crowning as

[49] Cf. Meyendorff, *Marriage*, 129. However, see Amié-Georges Martimort, 'The Contribution of Liturgical History to the Theology of Marriage' in Richard Malone and John R. Connory (eds.), *Contemporary Perspectives in Christian Marriage: Propositions and Papers from the International Theological Commission* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1984), 308, for his assertion that this was not always the case, and that the priest placing the ring on the fingers of the spouses was a development rather than something customary from the beginning. For the liturgical texts themselves, which have varying directions, see Searle and Stevenson, *Documents of the Marriage Liturgy*, 55ff.

[50] Nikephoros the Confessor, *Canones, ex Conciliis* §2, *PG* 100, 855/6.

[51] Paul Evdokimov, *The Sacrament of Love*, 156. Cf. Evdokinov, *The Sacrament of Love*, 128-30 for further instances where the blessing of the priest has historically been described as bring about the marital state. For an alternative perspective, cf. John Karmiris *A Synopsis of the Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Scranton: Christian Orthodox Edition, 1973), 109, where he states that it is both consent of the couple and the blessing of the priest or bishop which are 'indispensible to the performance of this sacrament.' As far as I am able to ascertain, Karmires expresses the lone divergent opinion among Orthodox theologians on this point.

comparable to the Eucharist,[52] thus providing a link between the Western celebration of marriage and the historic practice of the Christian East. However, there is no single portion of the Western liturgy which corresponds neatly with the actual crowning in the Byzantine liturgy. Rather, the Western rite preserves its own identity which is strongly shaped by the Roman legal tradition: *nuptias non concubitus, sed consensus facit*.[53]

In the West, it is the exchange of vows which brings the couple into a state of matrimony, as is evidenced by the priest's declaration that the two are joined at the end of what we might otherwise call the betrothal rite. In this regard, it underscores the historic western position that the couple are the ministers of the sacrament and is in direct contradiction to the theology of the Orthodox Church on who administers the sacraments where, 'theoretically, Orthodox sacramental theology – even in its scholastic, 'textbook' form – has preserved this…in opposition Roman Catholicism, that the priest is the 'minister' of marriage.'[54] Nor is this a belief of recent innovation, as Paul Evdokimov points out

> In the *Treatise on the Seven Sacraments* by the monk Job the Jasite (at the end of the thirteenth century), the minister of the sacrament is the *hiereus*, the priest or the bishop. In the seventeenth century, Nicholas Bulgaris specifics in his *Catecheses* (Verona, 1681) that the matter of the sacraments is the union of the spouses and that the form is in the blessing. In the same manner, Meletius Syrigos (Bucharest, 1690) and Metropolitan Plato of Moscow (eighteenth century) teach the unanimous doctrine: The priest is the minister of the sacrament that is instituted by God; mutual consent indicates that the betrothed are not bound by any other engagement, but that the grace results only from the rite performed. In no way, nor in any sense, can the spouses be the ministers of the sacrament.[55]

Nevertheless, this is precisely what the Western marriage liturgy conveys, especially in the form presented in the *SASB*. That the prayerbook versions of the marital liturgy were developed with a specific aim to reduce the sacramental conceptualization of marriage is already documented[56] and that alone is problematic from an Orthodox standpoint. The 1928 American *BCP* form is so lightly adapted by the *SASB* that it contains elements

---

[52] Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing*, 99.
[53] Martimort 'The Contribution of Liturgical History to the Theology of Marriage' in Malone and Connory (eds.), *Contemporary Perspectives in Christian Marriage*, 308.
[54] Meyendorff, *Marriage*, 25.
[55] Evidokimov, *The Sacrament of Love*, 129.
[56] Cf. Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing*, 91-3.

which still locate the sacramental activity exclusively with the couple and not the priest.[57] Equally problematic is the declaration of holy matrimony after the exchange of vows but before the exchange of blessed rings, since it implies that the exchange of vows and, problematically, the exchange of consent, is what has joined the two together in matrimony rather than the blessing of the priest.[58]

Though much attention is frequently focused on the problems of the Western rite eucharistic liturgies, the marriage rite within the *SASB* is truly an example of an instance where more really is less: less clear, less meaningful, and less complete. Of all the liturgies which have been brought over into Western Rite Orthodoxy, the marital liturgy of the *SASB* borders on incompetence on the part of the framers of the text in that the text is rubrically unsound rendering it practically incomprehensible at points, especially in regard to the place of prayers at the nuptial mass. On the other hand, while the marital liturgy has been altered to combine the nuptial blessing with the blessing for marriages celebrated apart from Mass, elements of the ceremony which necessitate change to bring the text into conformity with Orthodoxy have been left in place, most specifically the declaration of matrimony after the exchange of vows and not after the priestly blessing. One point of praise that Meyendorff has for the Western marital liturgy is the continued celebration of the marriage liturgy within the eucharistic liturgy, at least in theory, while simultaneously lamenting that the Orthodox East has not maintained this connection since

> the Roman Catholic Church has preserved the ancient Christian tradition in its discipline; a marriage between two Roman Catholics occurs in connection with a mass...A restoration of a similar discipline in the Orthodox Church would certainly fit the Orthodox theology of marriage better than it does the legal concepts which prevailed in Roman Catholicism at a time when Roman Catholic theology ceased to view its own traditional liturgy as a source of its theology![59]

Perhaps the best future for the Western rite marriage liturgy would be to bring the ideals expressed within the text more into conformity to the Orthodox tradition, specifically by

---

[57] Stevenson, *Nuptial Blessing*, 134-7.
[58] By contrast, the newer marriage rites do not have any declaration of matrimony after the exchange of vows (and in some cases like the *Rituale Romanum*) do not have a declaration of joining at all while others (like the *Lutheran Book of Worship*) retain a declarative formula after the exchange of vows.
[59] Meyendorff, *Marriage*, 25-6.

removing the declaration of marriage from after the exchange of vows to after the kiss of peace in the nuptial mass or to after the nuptial blessing if it is given outside of mass. This, and more careful consideration as to the direction and construction of the rite as it is presented in the *SASB* would provide a marriage rite which is not only Western, but in strict conformity with Orthodox theology, and in some ways, as Meyendorff states above, is actually more the authentic expression of the Orthodox theology of marriage than the current Byzantine practice.

The Penitential Rite

The penitential rite is also significantly different between *TOR* and the *SASB*, though in both instances it is exceptionally short. Within the *SASB*, the entire rite consumes only a single page, with the confession itself consisting primarily of the individual penitent reciting the *confiteor* from the eucharistic liturgy and a blessing from the priest. The rubrics do direct that the priest may enjoin a penance or 'address a few words'.[60] The penitential liturgy in *TOR* is slightly more substantial, consisting of two pages of text. *TOR* is more free-form, requiring the penitent to enumerate his sins and the priest to provide counsel, with no fixed form for the actual confession, other than the blessing, absolution and the form 'Father, forgive me for I have sinned' familiar from many feature films.

The form of penance as it is known today both in East and West largely developed out of what is called the 'tariff' system of penance as it developed in Ireland. Under this method of canonical discipline, based as it was on the monastic spirituality of the Irish Church, a penitent came to a confessor and confessed his or her sins; after the confession, they would receive a pre-determined act of contrition based on the category of offense they had committed and in completing the contrition, the penitent's sins would be considered as forgiven.[61] From this system, which spread to the continent prior to the Carolingian Period, it is not hard to see the beginnings of later Western assertions about penance and absolution, such as the importance of satisfaction to the penitential process;

[60] Trigg, et. al., *SASB*, 109.
[61] See James Dallen, *The Reconciling Community: The Rite of Penance* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, Company, 1986), 139-143, and Frank O'Loughlin, *The Future of the Sacrament of Penance* (Strathfield: St. Pauls Publications, 2007), 34-46.

indeed, in this period the act of confession was considered incidental, a means of getting at the real matter of the sacrament – the penance, and one where the idea of absolution, attached to confession or provided after the penance was performed, was totally unknown and indeed unthinkable.[62] Ultimately, this form of confession also came into South Europe and the Mediterranean basin and supplanted the earlier form of public penance practiced during the ante-Nicene and immediate post-Nicene period. What distinguishes the Eastern and Western forms of the sacrament (Eastern and Western) is not necessarily anything explicitly stated in the text, but the subsequent theology of how the liturgy works and what place the acts of contrition have within the same overall theological scheme.

The problem with properly evaluating the penitential liturgy is that the precise form for the penitential liturgy has never been definitively established in the West. What has been established is the formula of absolution, but all that proceeding the absolution is itself is to a certain degree optional. *Rituale Romanum* recommends that the penitent recite the *confetior*, but it permits even as little as *confiteor Deo omnipotenti, et tibi, pater* or the vernacular or the equivalent. The primary element of the penitential liturgy in *Rituale Romanum* consists of instructions for hearing the confession, guidance for the priest and an overall shape to the liturgy, but without a specific form. The liturgies in the *SASB* and *TOR* are themselves equally legitimate in terms of their Western form. Indeed, almost anything would have been and is presently permissible within *Rituale Romanum*, subject to local custom.

The state of the penitential liturgy in Western Rite Orthodoxy is highlighted John Mangels' comments on his initial experience with the revised confessional liturgy, one where the confessor and the confessing sit with one another rather than hidden in the 'traditional' confessional.[63] Confession in the Byzantine rite and in the post-Vatican II liturgy, takes place in the open church with the priest and penitent in full view of one another, though facing the icon of the Saviour in the Byzantine rite. The underlining the emphasis on confession is reconciliation not only with God but also with the Church against whom the sinner has equally offended. As to the 'traditional' nature of the

[62] O'Loughlin, *The Future of the Sacrament of Penance*, 36-7.
[63] Mangels, 'Orthodox Odyssey', in Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 21. The confessional booth is a rather late development, really arising only in the post-Tridentine era.

confessional box, Dudley and Pinnock point out that 'we should remember that the confessional, placed in an open and conspicuous part of the church and with a grating between priest and penitent, was partly a response to abuse of the sacrament and dates from the sixteenth century, becomes general in the following century. Before that people confessed in the open church, kneeling before the priest or seated at his side.'[64] Thus, the form after Vatican II shold not be problematic since it, superficially, resembles the Orthodox practice and it is at least slightly ironic that Mangels was opposed to it.

However, a more difficult aspect of the penitential liturgy is the portion that has become fixed, specifically the absolution. The Byzantine form is 'may God forgive you all through me a sinner, in this age and in that to come' and continuing onward. The classic form of Western absolution as given in *TOR* is 'Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee; and I by his authority absolve thee from every bond of excommunication, suspension and interdict, so far as I have power, and thou hast need.' The *SASB* modifies the Western formula by omitting any reference to the priest, but instead providing 'Almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life. The Almighty and merciful Lord grant you pardon, absolution, and remission of sins.' This simpler formula might be a preferable choice since it removes the older Western notions of the confessor as judge.

Nevertheless, we should be cautious about taking the formula for absolution too far. Timiadis rightly points out that

> the confessor prays, and God forgives. The priest ministers, and God absolves. He prays and he declares the will of God. By importunity he persuades men to come. But if he finds them unworthy, he keeps them away. The judgment of the confessor is devoid of any judicial feature, even if it is based on the authentic commission of Christ to bind and loose. For the pronouncement of forgiveness during confession is made by Christ himself and merely passes through the priest, as *signum visibile*. Christ is the main actor and the very source of the forgiving grace.[65]

However, it is precisely through the priest that the absolution of God does flow. In that regard, it is almost pushing *lex orandi* too far in the extreme to suggest that *ego te absolvo* is indicative of the priest exercising the sacrament in a juridical way, particularly

[64] Martin Dudley and Jill Pinnock, 'Rites of Penance and Reconciliation' in Martin Dudley and Geoffrey Rowell (eds.), *Confession and Absolution* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 181-2.
[65] Emilianos Timiadis, *The Sacrament of Confession and the Confessor*, 93.

since it is also preceded by *dominus noster Iesus Christus te absolvat*. Additionally, the indicative form of absolution is found among the Russian Churches, even if, as Schmemann asserts, that it is an aberration brought on by latinising tendencies during the time of Peter Moghila.[66] No one disputes the Orthodoxy of the Russian formula even though it is not depreciative as known among Greek-speaking Orthodoxy, so the question would remain what is necessarily problematic about it? The problem would seem not so much what is actually said but what is believed about what is said in the case of both forms of absolution, whether Latin or Russian. It is the context, presumed or real, that allows Hall to state that there is no theological difference between the Russian and Greek formula of absolution[67] while simultaneously causing Timiadis to state that in the Latin/Russian form, the onus is on the priest to provide absolution.[68]

Therefore, in this case it is difficult to say that the ritual itself is unorthodox in part because it finds expression in other Orthodox rites. That is not to say that further development of the text of the rite would not be advantageous. Indeed, while removing reference to the priest in the ritual text seems a proper track, in doing so there are inherent risks. The problem with removing absolutely every reference to the role of the priest in absolution is that it allows space to question whether or not sacramental absolution is even necessary at all, or at least paves the way for the Western Rite Orthodox to fall into a habit of confession not at all dissimilar from the non-Orthodox who happen to share a similar rite. Ultimately what is needed are perhaps twofold: first, a rite of confession and absolution that emphasizes the divine source of forgiveness while simultaneously highlighting that sin is not simply an offense against God but against the community as a whole, thus encouraging sacramental confession to Christ and his mystical body, as represented by the priest. This is not something exclusive to Western Rite Orthodoxy, but is applicable to the non-Orthodox Western rituals[69] and even to *TOR* of confession as well. However, even if a change in text is deemed not to be desirable, more important is

[66] Cf. Schmemann, 'Confession and Communion: A Report to the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Orthodox Church in America' (Sousset: Orthodox Church in America, 1972), 13.
[67] Christine Hall, 'Confession in the Orthodox Church Some Observations on the Orthodox Practice of the Sacrament of Confession' in Dudley and Rowell (eds.), *Confession and Absolution* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 123.
[68] Timiadis, *The Sacrament of Confession and the Confessor*, 94.
[69] However Roman Catholics have gone farther than many renaming the sacrament 'Reconciliation', thus emphasizing the communal aspect, both divine and human.

to ensure that there is a proper understanding of the purpose of the liturgy through thorough catechesis. Remembering that 'context shapes text'[70] is precisely why the Russian indicative form is Orthodox and the Latin indicative form is not. By promoting as proper catechesis of confession and absolution, one may effectively reduce misunderstanding which would otherwise arise from the form of absolution provided.

Sacraments of the Sick and Dying

Anointing of the sick, or Unction, is not well attested to in the West prior to the eighth and ninth century. It is passed over without mention in the writings of Augustine of Hippo, despite an otherwise large corpus of writings wherein the rest of the sacraments warrant substantial treatment. The foundational text for the practice of the sacrament in the West during the first millennium is Innocent I writing to Decentius of Gubbio ca. 416, wherein he offers an interpretation of James 5.13-16.[71] Subsequent authors who mention the rite do so through the lens of Innocent's letter. However, the majority of reference to anointing of the sick is in synodical legislation or homiletic references wherein the faithful are encouraged to seek the sacraments of the church for healing rather than witchdoctors or sorcerers.[72]

The sacrament was little used int he historic West, evidenced by the fact that it is goes unmentioned almost universally in Western texts, but what could be the cause of such neglect? Gusmer is quick to conclude to that the growing practice of the priest charging for the administration of the sacrament, thus making it prohibitively expensive to the poor,[73] a point which is extensively supported by an ever increasing body of conciliar legislation at the turn of the millennium.[74] On the other hand, Bernhard Poschmann cites the growing connection between anointing in penance and the anointing of the sick, especially as the latter began to be performed following or in lieu of

[70] Irwin, *Context and Text*, 56.
[71] Innocent I, *Epistola* XXV (*ad Decentio episcopo*) III, *PL* 20, 517-8.
[72] Charles W. Gusmer, *And You Visited Me: Sacramental Ministry to the Sick and the Dying* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1984), 15-6, quoting extensively from Caesarius of Arles, ca. 502-543. For evidence that the practice of seeking 'sorcerers' for healing rites continued much later, see Andrew J. Cuschieri *Anointing of the Sick: A Theological and Canonical Study* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1993), quoting Johnas of Orléans, ca. 818-841, from *De Institutione Laicali* 3.14.261
[73] Gusmer, *And You Visited Me*, 28.
[74] Cuschieri, *Anointing of the Sick*, 37-8.

confession and absolution on a recipient in *extremis*.[75] Cuschieri disputes both explanations and instead points to conciliar legislation which removed the ability of the laity to self-administer blessed oil in cases of illness, serious or otherwise, and instead restricted the anointing to the priest alone. This, coupled with a greater emphasis on the spiritual healing caused by the de-emphasizing the possibility of physical healing, contributed both to the sacrament's growing unpopularity and the tendency to reserve its administration until the last possible moments.[76]

The sacrament had a different history in the East. The church in Byzantium primarily administered healing through its participation and direction of the hospitals of the empire. However, rational medicine was the primary means of the church's participation in the healing of the body meant that there was little development of a separate rite of anointing, even though *Barberini gr. 336* provides prayers over oil destined to be used in anointing of the sick, and *St. Petersburg GPB, Porfirij gr. 226* (10th cent.) has the broader outlines of a rite in the earliest stages of its development.[77] It is this period in the ninth and tenth centuries that development of the rites for the sick begin in earnest as a means of providing the church with a continued connection to the function of physical healing in society. Patriarch Arsenius Autoreianus (1255-60) increased the number of readings from two to seven and also increased the number of priests to perform the anointing from two to seven, while Symeon of Thessalonica added prayers for the forgiveness of sins to the liturgy, providing essentially the shape of the liturgy as it exists in the Byzantine rite today.[78]

TOR has a more expansive liturgy for the sick and the dying, including forms for blessing the sick and a parallel form for when the subject is a child, a form for the communion of the sick, and for administering unction and *viaticum*. The actual arrangements of the rites within *TOR* is confusing, in that the liturgies of the sick and dying are not connected together sequentially through *TOR*. The liturgy for visiting the sick and the blessing of a sick child are separated from communion of the sick by the

[75] Bernhard Poschmann, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick* (New York: Herder and Herder New York; 1964), 244-6.
[76] Cuschieri, *Anointing of the Sick*, 47-8.
[77] Parenti, 'Care and Anointing of the Sick in the East' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.), *HLS* IV, 162-3.
[78] Stanley Harakas, *Health and Medicine in the Eastern Orthodox Tradition: Faith, Liturgy, and Wholeness* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1990), 102.

order for Penance and administering communion outside of mass. The liturgy of unction is identical to the liturgy in *Rituale Romanum*, though *TOR* does not contain the so-called seven penitential psalms as a part of or appendix to the liturgies for the sick. The form for visitation for the sick is similar to *Rituale Romanum*, as is the commendation of a soul and the communion of the sick. The latter liturgy remains especially close to the Roman form in that it presumes communion will be 'dry', that is, consisting solely of the bread rather than administered with both elements.

The liturgy as provided within *TOR*, by not having seen substantial change in either the text or the rubrics of the liturgy has left something of the older scholastic theology of the purpose of anointing of the sick in the order. In particular, the priest at the conclusion of the rite is to exhort the sick person to 'die in the Lord' and, unless there may be some time between giving the sacrament and the death of the sick person, the priest should also provide the liturgy for the commendation of a soul. While this could be evidence of careless editing of *TOR*, it is equally reasonable that no such change from *unctio extremis* to anointing of the sick was ever envisioned. The administration of unction to the dying is not what is at issue per se since, along with viaticum and penance, administration of the oil of the sick would be appropriate. Rather, what is problematic is the exclusive administration of the sacrament only to the dying as was done in the Western Church for most of the second millennium and as is the practice envisioned by the editors of *TOR*. We have already looked at some potential reasons for why the piety of the medieval West rejected anointing for the sick unless the individual was in danger of, or even at the moment of death. While there is dispute over why the anointing was delayed, medieval theologians simultaneously looked at the practice of anointing of the sick as it was administered in their time and developed a theology of the sacrament which emphasized the forgiveness of sins as the purpose of the sacrament, to the detriment or even exclusion of administration of the sacrament for the purpose of physical health. And, despite the reforms of the sacrament envisioned by Vatican II which return the sacrament to its primitive purpose as a sacrament of bodily healing, the belief in forgiveness of sins as the primary or exclusive purpose of the sacrament has not disappeared; Cuschieri states that

> ...the Carolingian Reform started the gradual change in the perception of the Sacrament from that of the sick to that of the dying. However, radical this concept of the Sacrament appears to have been, the theology did not change in its substantiality. The adjustment, *per se*, consisted in the swinging of the pendulum in the right direction: the spiritual healing was conceived of as the main and absolute purpose, the physical healing as secondary and conditional purpose of the Sacrament.[79]

On the other hand, the proposition of the Orthodox Church has primarily been that the anointing of the sick is for healing of the body, mind, and soul, without any particular ordering of which purpose is primary.

By contrast, the rite in the *SASB* is taken directly from the 1928 American *BCP*, excepting that the rubrics have been changed and the order of the two prayers is reversed, so that the anointing comes first in the *SASB*. The section of the prayerbook where the formulas for anointing the sick are found almost seems to form an appendix to the rites for the sick.[80] The resulting liturgy in the *SASB* is thereby reduced to little more than half a page and, from the title and rubrics, is intended as a public ceremony to be inserted at some point into another liturgy, such as the Eucharist. Presumably, the same liturgy could be used in private circumstances, such as during a visit to a hospital or the home of an ill person, but the rubrics do not specifically permit this. Nevertheless, while the liturgy is extensively shortened and the vision of the rubrics is inherently limited as to the administration of the sacrament, the ritual related to the sick in the *SASB* is preferable to that of the 1928 *BCP* or even *TOR* precisely because of its brevity. Massey Shepherd observes that

> …this Office [of the sick] is little used to day in the form here set forth, despite the extensive revisions made in it for the 1928 Book. Instead, the clergy take advantage of the discretion given them to use such Psalms and Prayers contained in the Office, and other devotions, as may seem most suitable and helpful to the individual concerned. The structure of the service is unlike that of any other Prayer Book Office, even to the extent of employing antiphons with the Psalms, and hence it is too unfamiliar and too complicated for a sick person to manage in his weakness.[81]

---

[79] Cuschieri, *Anointing of the Sick*, 56.
[80] And, in the 1928 American *BCP*, the rite for anointing the sick comes after a long series of prayers said over a person near the time of death. Why the prayers come at this particular place rather than earlier in the rite can only be speculated.
[81] Shepherd, *American Prayer Book Commentary*, 308.

Thus, the current form in the *SASB* is not without its advantage from a pastoral perspective. Additionally, the liturgical context of providing anointing of the sick within the eucharistic liturgy is certainly laudable from both an Eastern and a Western standpoint. Historically, the Byzantine rite has administered unction in the context of the eucharistic liturgy while simultaneously providing a form for administering the sacrament when it is not possible to celebrate the Eucharist.[82] For the Western context, since unction has begun to be administered at times other than near death, there has been an increasing popularity in offering 'services of healing' where unction is a part of the Eucharistic rite.[83] However, it would be desirable to see the rite extended somewhat so as to provide for a more meaningful use in private, and with the option of adding other rites for the sick, including communion/*viaticum* as the case is appropriate without seemingly restricting administration of the sacrament to death as is the case in *TOR*.

Conclusions

The several texts which make up the administration of the sacraments in Western Rite Orthodoxy are a significant subset of the Western rite but have not been subjected to the same scrutiny as the eucharistic liturgies. While some of the liturgies provided in both the SASB and *TOR* are significant improvements over their counterparts in terms of how they are administered, there are persistent liturgical or dogmatic anomalies that are perpetuated by these liturgies as they are currently celebrated. The most egregious difficulties are found in the marriage liturgy, followed by the baptismal liturgy. The anointing of the sick in the *SASB* is certainly an improvement over its predecessor from the 1928 American *BCP*. Some of these difficulties stem from a seemingly hurried compilation in the case of *TOR*, but problems understanding both the Byzantine and Western rites and Orthodox theology have created the mish-mashed liturgies that are to be found in the *SASB*. Further revision of these specific liturgies would be necessary to make them more sensible and more theologically sound, though with the verbatim reissue

[82] P. Meyendorff, *The Anointing of the Sick* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2009), 41ff.
[83] Especially in North America, it has become common for large churches, Protestant and Catholic, to offer a mass or service of healing on a monthly or sometimes even weekly basis. This is in addition to the normal pastoral care of the sick.

of the *SASB* in 2005 it is unlikely that they will receive any further consideration anytime soon and thus are to be considered definitively constituted for the foreseeable future.

CHAPTER 9
CRITICISMS OF WESTERN RITE ORTHODOXY

Western Rite Orthodoxy has not been without critics, which is not surprising given its controversial status. There have been critics from outside Orthodoxy and there are several Western rite proponents who are nevertheless critical of alternative forms of the Western rite co-existing with their own favoured version.[1] The former do not concern us her because these individuals are typically not opposed to Western Rite Orthodoxy in theory; rather, they opposed the fact that the present Western Rite Orthodoxy is constituted primarily of their former communicants who left under less than positive circumstances. Likewise, the latter are not opposed to the Western rite itself as much as they opposed particular forms of Western Rite Orthodoxy. What follows are criticisms by Eastern Rite Orthodox. They are grouped into four basic objections to Western Rite Orthodoxy, though it is important to remember that these are not the only possible objections, nor are the necessarily mutually exclusive since there is some overlap between the first and second objection. Rather, these are the most commonly heard objections and are representative of popular opposition to Western Rite Orthodoxy.

Orthodoxy Does Not Need A Western Rite

This first statement seems obvious at first since it makes an observation that is categorically true: Orthodoxy does not need a Western rite because she simply does not. The problem is not so much in the statement itself, which is indeed so obvious as to be a

[1] This is most clearly expressed by the several blogs devoted to Western Rite Orthodoxy: Ben Johnson's *Western Orthodoxy* blog frequently featured posts attacking various proponents of Sarum-style liturgies, especially Aidan Keller's liturgy, normally by questioning the scholarly credentials of rite's editor why simultaneously purporting the academic superiority of AWRV clergy. *Western Rite Critic* offered itself as a more "constructive" form of criticism of the AWRV, though without offering any specific examples of how the AWRV liturgies could be improved. More honest with its reactionary and antagonistic appeal was *Blogging the Fraud* by Joseph Suaiden, which regards anything except the Holy Synod of Milan's Sarum-style liturgy to be wholly unorthodox Roman Catholicism/Protestantism in disguise, though it was only operational for a few months in 2008.

truism, but in the underlying assumption that are left unspoken, and that is where the deep significance of this objections lies. We can identify at least three unspoken predications to the statement: 'because the Byzantine rite is innately superior to the Western rite in transmitting Orthodoxy', 'because the West is heretical and therefore the Western rite is automatically heretical,' and 'because the ethos of the West is opposed to Orthodoxy.' Each of these rationales have their own underlying assumptions about the nature of Orthodoxy, the West, and the role of culture in the Church. What brings all three elements together under a single heading is that they share a common feature, what Andrew Sopko refers to as 'psychological negativism, an unhealthy by-product of the cultural superiority which Byzantium did indeed once possess over the West for many centuries but eventually lost.'[2]

The 'otherness' of the Byzantine rite to Western Christians has been cited previously as a justification for the existence of a Western rite.[3] The argument posits that, because the Byzantine rite represents a culture which is entirely beyond the cultural experience of most Westerners, it is likely to be a barrier to a conversion rather than an aid. In this regard, critics of the Western rite argue that those who prefer a Western rite should be content with an Eastern rite because the nature of the Church itself is Eastern rather than Western. Stratman is representative when he states that '[the Orthodox Church's] Oriental spirit, or Gospel spirit, to use an equivalent expression, is not a development. It was there all the time. It was in the East that the Gospel of truth arose…and it is the same East which has always been the source of its true traditions and spirit.'[4] This itself is little more than a vestigial manifestation of the assumed cultural superiority of Greek culture over and against Latin culture, one which itself not only contributed to the Great Schism, but further served as a barrier to reconciliation between the two sides historically.[5] The claim that Western Christians should be satisfied with the Eastern rite because Christianity is Eastern, because Jesus and his Apostles were Eastern, is itself a confusion of the issue brought about by woolly-headed thinking. In one sense,

---

[2] Sopko, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Case Study and Reappraisal', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980), 255.
[3] Cf., e.g., John Rossner, 'Orthodoxy and the Future of Western Christianity', *SVTQ* 14.3 (1970) 134-5; Mott, 'Some Perspectives on the Western Rite – I', *SVTQ* 26.2 (1982) 124-5; and Alexy Young 'An Introduction', *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 5-6.
[4] Stratman, 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy', 9.
[5] This is in addition to the very real dogmatic disagreements which are, themselves, the product of two alienated cultures.

these critics are correct in that, from the perspective of the Rome at the time of the Early Church, Jesus and his Apostles and his teachings were Eastern because they originated in a cultural milieu of the Eastern portion of the Roman Empire. The same basic truth can be said of the liturgy of the Churches of the Eastern portion of the former Roman Empire.

But there is a problem in assuming that there is any such thing as a monolithic 'Eastern' context. Certainly, the Eastern rite is 'Eastern', but to be more precise, it is Greek and to be even more specific, it is Byzantine rather than Attic. Attic Greek culture, the culture of ancient Athens, is the culture of Socrates and Plato which imparts its influence to all of Europe, East and West, including the Byzantine Empire. However, while Byzantine culture absorbs Greco-Attic culture, it is nevertheless distinct from it, for it is a specific synthesis of the Greco-Attic with a reinterpretation of Roman culture. This is the cultural context of the Eastern rite, and thus it is properly the Byzantine rite, because it is specifically born of the cultural synthesis that took place in Constantinople rather than Athens. By contrast, 'the West' is the result of a synthesis of Roman and Germano-Frankish culture. The Roman culture would consist of the elements found in the Italian peninsula and transmitted in Latin while the Germano-Frankish element is an adaptation of the Roman elements with learning that occurs during the Carolingian renaissance. For those who would contend that Socrates is just as much the cultural inheritance of the West as it is of the East, it is worthwhile to remember that Greek culture was largely lost to the West until the Renaissance, when it was rediscovered and celebrated by humanists in their mistaken belief that this was the true cultural foundation of European civilisation.

While it is true that Jesus and his Apostles are Eastern in the same basic sense of Greek civilization, in that it lies east of Rome, that is hardly the most specific description. A more specific description would be that Jesus and his Apostles are Semitic in culture, and to be more precise, are of the Palestinian Jewish variety of Western Semitic culture. There is a distinction between Palestinian Jewishness and Greco-Attic or even Byzantine culture. This distinction is addressed in the fact that there was conflict between Hellenistic Jews (those who had absorbed elements of Greco-Attic culture) and Palestinian Jews, and this is a conflict which is made itself manifest in the very first years of the Church, as the Bible attests in Acts 3. Thus, the Christian message of the Gospel,

which arises in the Palestinian Jewish culture of Jesus and the Twelve (not to mention the majority of the scriptures that constitute the Old Testament), needs to be 'translated' into something comprehensible to the prevailing Greek and Latin cultures of the era. This is a process we can see going on even in the time of the Apostle Paul and his attempts to harmonize the Hellenistic and Jewish factions within early Christianity. It seems to be something very obvious, but which has nevertheless been ignored or forgotten. To be direct, fifteen hundred years of dressing Jesus in Greek robes in the sacred art of East *and* West has made us forget that Jesus was never actually Greek at all.

This assumption that the Orthodox Church and the culture the Gospel arose from are Eastern and therefore the same thing also has enormous implications for the current objection. The underlying premise is that if the Western Orthodox accept the 'Eastern' Jesus without complaint or desire to Westernize him, they should therefore be willing to accept the liturgy of the East without any need for a westernisation of it, either. But the truth is that neither the West nor the 'East' has accepted Jesus or the Gospel without any sort of acculturation, as has been apparent by the imposition of Greek philosophical vocabulary on to the Gospel, a process which no Orthodox Christian would regard as illegitimate.[6] So even the Eastern Church has engaged in its own sort of acculturation and accommodation to the Gospel, which detractors to the Western rite have nevertheless decried as illegitimate for Christianity in the West.

We can sometimes detect an air of superiority regarding the Byzantine rite from the Western rite's most ardent detractors. Sometimes these observations are quite sophisticated and have a distinct theological underpinning, as we see in the case of Schmemann; more often, they are in reality the sort of gross subjectivism that is typified in Stratman, who finds the character of the Roman rite to be one of

[6] This is not to say that the Greek context of early Christianity is irrelevant or unimportant. Greek culture provided a vehicle for interpreting the Hebrew scriptures and the Christian faith to the non-Jewish world. Furthermore, Christianity has historically claimed that Greek and Latin culture were being divinely prepared to receive the revelation of the Gospel, the philosophical quests coming to their own natural conclusion at precisely the correct time for the audience to be receptive. In that sense, one can agree with Georges Florovsky's assessment that 'we are all Greek' (theologically speaking). Simultaneously, this must be qualified to some degree as the Latin tradition has contributed to the common theological heritage, so there remains a subtle danger in Florovsky's statement. Furthermore, the difference between Greek and Jewish culture cannot be overstated in this case, precisely because many Western rite critics, in saying we are all Greek, do not seem to intend merely theologically, but culturally as well. In this case, consistent repetition of the historical context of Jesus is important because the implication in stating Jesus' easternness without further specificity is a deceptive straw-man.

> Imperialism, regimentation, coldness of spirit, materialistic efficiency, legalism: these are some of the Roman-Latin traits which distorted Western Christianity into the travesty of a Church which for almost a thousand years has been the most dangerous and insidious enemy of Christ and His Immaculate Bride. Observe the Latin Mass critically and behold the Manifestation of every one of these traits![7]

But such a criticism of the Western Church is highly subjective and, taken with the balance of Stratman's thoughts on the subject, may best be described as xenophobic. What is more, most of his criticism about the Roman rite could easily be made of the Byzantine rite by individuals approaching the Byzantine rite from a different perspective.[8] But Stratman goes on for several more pages denigrating everything Western from a highly subjective standpoint, oblivious to the possibility that the same criticism can be turned back on the Byzantine rite in many instances, precisely because of their subjective nature. Such subjective accusations are hardly new, and they have been present within Christianity since at least the seventh century. Richard Southern summarizes the attitude of the era as one of questioning 'if customs differ, how (they ask) is discipline to be preserved? If they differ obstinately, what is this but schism? How can there be unity of men will not renounce their differences?'[9] Though such attitudes are old, they are hardly helpful.

Schmemann's critique is certainly more nuanced and is made comprehensible by his methodology of *lex orandi*, *lex credendi*: 'this criticism itself is rooted primarily in my deep conviction that the Eastern liturgical tradition is *alone* today in having preserved, in spite of all historical 'deficiencies,' the fullness of the Church's *lex orandi*.'[10] However, it is precisely that methodology that leads him to a false conclusion, that is, because the West ultimately came into a state of schism and heresy, there must be some defect in the rite because the rite is the source of the heretical theology. Consequently, no other rite aside from the Byzantine rite can and perhaps never could

---

[7] Stratman, 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy', 3.

[8] My own experience is perhaps illustrative in this regard. In taking my wife to a Greek Orthodox Church for the first time, her observations of the Byzantine rite were essentially the same as those of Stratman regarding the Western rite, to which she also added ostentatious, personally meaningless, and incomprehensible, the latter because the majority of the rite was celebrated in Greek with English only interspersed at the lessons and the Creed.

[9] Richard W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1970), 57.

[10] Schmemann, 'Some Reflections Upon "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 268, emphasis original.

adequately convey the fullness of Orthodoxy. And yet, he is not averse to stating in other places that the source of the West's troubles was its having severed theology from its true source and ultimate arbiter in the form of the liturgy, a process he sees taking place in the Orthodox Church and is quick to decry.[11] The later scenario, obviously, is the case for the history of the West, namely that the liturgy ceased to be a source of theology and ultimately became one of its many subjects. In that regard, we should meet Schmemann's methodological assumption, that the Church only believes what it prays, and its ensuing critique, with an equally robust criticism: sometimes people believe more than what they pray and sometimes they pray what they don't believe for appearance sake.

However, it must also be remembered that Schememann specifically regards the Eastern rite as having preserved the *lex orandi* of early Christianity,[12] regards elements such as the Paschal canon of St John of Damascus as closer to the common Catholic heritage as anything else within the Christian tradition.[13] Furthermore, despite his critique of Western Rite Orthodoxy on the basis of its liturgy, it is clear that Schmemann is arguably more concerned with the people who make up the Western rite, whether they have sufficiently absorbed an Orthodox ethos or are merely attempting to find a safe shelter beyond their form ecclesiological home where they can continue their previous life, dogmatically and liturgically, without interference.[14] This is certainly a valid pastoral concern, but it is also highly individualistic and, in a certain sense, a subjective judgement. It is a question that needs to be investigated more thoroughly with regards to Western Rite Orthodoxy as it is practiced, but does not, in this author's opinion, address

[11] Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (London: Faith Press, Ltd., 1966), 16-21. See also Schmemann, 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America II: The Liturgical Problem', *SVSQ* 8.4 (1964) 164-85.
[12] Schmemann, "Some Reflections Upon 'A Case Study,'" *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 268
[13] Schmemann, "Notes and Comments: The Western Rite," *SVSQ* (NS) 2.4 (1958) 30.
[14] This is brought out, for example, in Schmemann's comment that making a Western liturgy Orthodox involves more than textual changes ('Some Reflections Upon 'A Case Study,'" *SVTQ* 24.4, (1980) 268), but is directly stated in his previous comments that jurisdictional belongings, minimal assent to specific doctrinal and liturgical points, or "mechanical" understanding of Apostolic Succession are "a very real danger to Orthodoxy" and "the replacement of Orthodoxy of 'content' by an Orthodoxy of 'form'" ("Notes and Comments: The Western Rite," *SVSQ* (NS) 2.1 (1958) 30). Of course, the very same criticism could have been made of convert parishes which use the Eastern rite, so there is not necessarily anything specific to Western Rite Orthodoxy, though Schemann would doubtless argue the danger created is even greater within the Western rite than in if the converts are formed in the Byzantine rite.

the Western rite's legitimacy *in abstracto* as a legitimate expression of the Orthodox faith, and thus not germane to the present question.[15]

Schmemann's critique, while established by his methodology, probably would strike a chord with the average Orthodox believer. Stratman's comment, while at the extreme end of Orthodoxy in America, nevertheless is representative of powerful feelings of antagonism towards the West and things Western. We might expect that it comes from a 'less enlightened time,' but if this is so, such enlightenment has only come about very recently. We are thereby left to question if Orthodoxy in the West really gotten over its 'psychological negativism' as has been protested by Schmemann and Dye, individually or, as is implied, collectively? Certainly, Michael Johnson believes that Orthodoxy has done so through its receptivity towards the saints of the pre-schism and their commemoration within the Byzantine rite:

> If we can picture Overbeck in 19th century England we might realize why he felt an Orthodoxy using a 'western rite' was absolutely essential if the Church was to have a viable mission in the West. Overbeck would have only been able to experience the worship of Orthodoxy as done among recent immigrants, using not English, but the languages of their mother countries. No wonder he might reach the conclusion that only an Orthodoxy with a different rite, that had a western memory, could ever again be the church of the venerable Bede….Orthodoxy doesn't have to have a 'western rite' to have a western memory. With this in mind, let us suppose Overbeck's experience of the Church had been quite different. Suppose he had attended the celebration of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom on the feast of the venerable Bede and there in the narthex was a beautiful icon of this saint for veneration by the faithful. Suppose, too that the Liturgy had been conducted entirely in English. What could he find missing to celebrate the feast of this great saint of the early Christian west? True, the Liturgy would not be served in exactly the same way as Bede himself would have done (but then, neither - by a long shot - would the 'western rite' liturgies of St. Tikhon or St. Gregory be the same as done by the venerable Bede).[16]

---

[15] Schmeman can also be read as stating that the real problem with Western Rite Orthodoxy is the lack of a living Orthodox West; thus, for Western rite liturgies, potential converts must either invent what is necessary or borrow something which has already been made up, often uncritically. Woolfenden similarly notes that the Western rite liturgies are primarily experiment and that 'it may not be healthy to live our spiritual lives in a laboratory' (Woolfenden, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 192). It is this tendency towards liturgical archaeology, uncritical borrowing, and experimentation which is amply documented elsewhere in the thesis, and with which this author agrees.

[16] Michael Johnson, 'The "Western Rite": Is it Right for Orthodoxy', *The Priest* 5.5 (1995). <<http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/johnson.html>>. However, Johnson is off the mark in his assumption that Overbeck would have found that nothing could be lacking in the English Celebration of

Though it would be impossible to gauge the extent of the venation of Western saints within Orthodoxy,[17] perhaps an anecdotal and admittedly arbitrary guess can be hazarded. Orthodoxy in North America has seen significant growth in the past century, evidenced by the founding of scores of new parishes. Judging by patronal names alone, and excluding those which could be understood as referencing individuals who could be either Eastern or Western (such as St Gregory, who could be Gregory Dialogus or Gregory the Theologian if no modifier is included) or one of the Apostles, we find that parishes dedicated to Western saints, with the exception of Western rite parishes, are almost non-existent. Among the three largest jurisdictions in North America (The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, the Antiochian Archdiocese, and the OCA), there are only five parishes that can be described as having distinctly Western patronal names. There are none in the Greek Orthodox Archdioces and four in the OCA: St Aidan of Lindisfarne Mission, Cranbrook, BC; St Benedict of Nursia, Montreal, QC; St Ambrose of Milan Mission, Roanoke, VA; and St Cyprian of Carthage Mission, Richmond, VA. Within the Antiochian Archdiocese, aside from the Western rite parishes, only one is named for a Western saint: St Vincent of Lerins in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; that leaves five Eastern rite parishes out of nearly 1,000 which bear the name of a distinctively Western saint.[18]

Certainly, such a note is simultaneously idiosyncratic and anecdotal, but it does serve to point out that while the Western rite is not required for a Western memory, without a Western rite there is little in the way of that Western memory. While it can be pointed out that important Western saints such as Patrick of Ireland have begun reappearing on the calendars of Orthodox churches in the West, we are left wanting for any effectual evidence that those saints are even commemorated. The point of parish names goes at least so far as to demonstrate that these Western saints would be commemorated in at least these places if for no other reason than the occasion of a

---

the Byzantine rite. Stephen Hatherly advocated for the Byzantine rite in English, yet his objective was bitterly opposed by Overbeck as insufficient. See Chapter 2 above for further details.

[17] Indeed, what precisely could be defined as a 'Western' saint in the first place since may individuals are venerated with equal zeal in both calendars, St Nicholas of Myra being perhaps the most significant instance.

[18] Anecdotally, the most common parish name is Sts Peter and Paul in the OCA and Holy Trinity in the Antiochian and Greek Orthodox Archdioceses. If we account for the various festal titles, the Theotokos and derivative titles have a solid majority in all three jurisdictions.

patronal festival. It also leaves untouched the question of how these same saints are received in traditionally Orthodox places, whether Patrick of Ireland makes it into the calendar of, for example, the Church of Georgia or not, without mentioning if he is actually commemorated. The primary fallacy in Johnson's argument is the assumption that inclusion on the calendar, or even commemoration in the liturgy, is evidence of a 'Western memory'. To turn the point on its head, John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzos all appear in the Roman calendar though one doubts very seriously that Johnson would thereby admit that the Roman Catholic Church has an 'Eastern memory'.

For the Orthodox Church to have something of a Western memory, it would seem logical that the East, without exception would be able to see in the West something familiar and evocative of the memory. And yet, there are many examples, historically and presently, of those who regard the West as something alien and wholly foreign, not only to the East, but to Christianity in general. The latter is certainly the position that Stratman takes in saying 'from the point of view either of justice or logic, their position is no different from that of converted African savages….Logically, the situation is no different than if there never been any Western Rite.'[19] Even more bothersome is his directly claim that 'the true Gospel spirit [is] Eastern in the sense that it is anti-Western.'[20] While Stratman's view is somewhat extreme, the practical result is the same even in more moderated views: Western converts should adopt the Byzantine rite because the Byzantine rite is Orthodox. This leads to the question of precisely where the categorical rejection of the West came from. Sopko points to 'an unhealthy by-product of the cultural superiority which Byzantium did indeed once possess over the West for many centuries but eventually lost.'[21] Certainly, there are numerous examples of this presumed cultural superiority by Easterners, most notably Theophylakt of Ochrid, who assumed that all Westerners were uneducated savages and assumed Latin to be an impoverished language

[19] Stratman, 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy', 2.
[20] Ibid., 9.
[21] Sopko, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Case Study', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 255.

incapable of theological expression.[22] And certainly, as we have seen, animosity was present between the two sides for a long period of time.

The categorical rejection of the West and all things Western is therefore not new, but it is hardly a relic of the past. Among Greek theologians, the neo-patristic school, commonly identified with the theologies of John Romanides, Christos Yannaras, and, to a lesser extent, John Zizioulas, makes a determined rejection of the West and all things Western as foreign to Orthodoxy.[23] Romanides is particularly firm in his rejection of the West due to his rejection of Augustinian theology, which he views as the origin of scholastiscm and consequently of every divergence of the West from the East.[24] And Romanides is not alone in his conclusions, with Yannaras succinctly stating at the outset that 'Augustine's theology was decisive, offering an ideal basis for a differentiated Western Christianity.'[25] While Augustine is not the sole genesis of theology in the West despite conclusions to the contrary by some Orthodox theologians, he is in some way symbolic of that theology, and thus an explicit rejection of Augustine is a rejection of Western Christianity.[26] That Romanides traces the theological separation of East and West to such an early period would mean that the tree is cut from the root long before anything approaching the Western rite (at least in any extant form) could arise.

Certainly, we can disagree with Romanides' conclusions about Augustine and his role in the creation of Western Christianity,[27] but again to those theologians who oppose

---

[22] Kolbaba 'The Orthodoxy of the Latins in the Twelfth Century', in Andrew Louth and Augustine Cassidy (eds.), *Byzantine Orthodoxies* (London: SPCK, 2006), 201.

[23] George Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou, 'Augustine and the Orthodox', *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, 30-6.

[24] These were not, of course, the first to decry Western influence in the Orthodox Church. St Nikodemos the Athonite in his collection of canons of the Orthodox Church is particularly antagonistic towards the Latins, writing in a time of particular anti-Latin popular sentiment. Nicodemos directed his antagonism against the Latins in regards to the validity of their sacraments, particularly baptism in his commentaries on various baptismal canons of the ecumenical councils, most notably Nicaea I (325) c. §8; Constantinople I (381) c. §7; and Pentetheke (691) c. §95. His commentary goes to great lengths to justify leniency in the admission of Arians, Nestorians, and Monophysites, but in regards to Latins he is unequivocally adamant, stating that all are to be rebaptized.

[25] Christos Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006), 16.

[26] This could be qualified in the case of Romanides since he rejects Frankish Christianity rather than what he would identify as authentic West Roman Christianity, though the practical result is the same regardless of the phrasing.

[27] Cf. Demacopoulos and Papanikolaou, 'Augustine and the Orthodox', in Papanikolaou and Demacopoulos (eds.), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, 11-40 and Peter Galadza, 'The Liturgical

'the West' and particularly Western influence in Orthodoxy the symbolism Augustine provides is a tempting target.

> It is illuminating that the unequivocal condemnation of Augustine by Orthodox theologians first appears in early nineteenth-century Russia in its Slavophile form and then reappears in the late 1950s among Greek theologians. In both situations, the anti-Augustine sentiment emerges together with a reaction against what is perceived to be western influences that are incompatible with the intellectual and spiritual tradition in Russia and Greece. The move toward a restoration of a more authentic, national, intellectual, and spiritual identity in these Orthodox countries was based on a construction of a particular set of categories, namely 'the West' and 'the East,' and an understanding of these categories in terms of diametrical opposition.[28]

This brings us back to the question of 'psychological negativism' that Sopko identified, which both Schmemann and Johnson deny has any effect on their estimation of the Western rite's orthodoxy. Johnson's objection is the more flawed than Schmemann's, but the conclusion he reaches is more damaging. His conclusion that providing the Byzantine rite in modern English and commemorating important Western saints is sufficient demonstration of a Western memory or overcomes Sopko's psychological negativism is simple, yet it draws an irrelevant conclusion: one may speak English as one's native language and yet be hostile towards the West and all things Western. Insofar as Romanides and other theologians working within the neo-Patristic synthesis exhibit this negativism, Romanides takes it to an extreme level which '[interprets] the "West" as diametrically opposed to the "East", both theologically and in terms of its cultural ethos.'[29] Thus, the West is no longer simply something that went astray and could be brought back into conformity with Orthodoxy, but is now to be seen as something which Orthodoxy must rejected as unorthodox, at least from Augustine forward.

Romanides approaches the separation of East and West not as a consequence of a growing separate ecclesial life, but the domination, even genocide, of the 'West Romans' by an external force in the Frankish kingdoms. In Romanides' view, far from there being a 'Latin Church' and a 'Greek Church,' there was a 'Roman Church' composed primarily

---

Commemoration of Augustine in the Orthodox Church: An Ambiguous *Lex Orandi* for an Ambiguous *Lex Credendi*', *SVTQ* 52.1 (2008) 111-130.

[28] Demacopoulos and Papanikolaou, 'Augustine and the Orthodox' in Papanikolaou and Demacopoulos (eds.), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, 37.

[29] Ibid., 28.

of the Byzantines and inhabitants of Italy and a 'Frankish Church' which developed apart from direct continuity with Roman Christianity.[30] However, such a dichotomy ignores the general evidence from history,[31] especially the fact that 'so far from wanting to remake the Western Roman Empire in their own image, and so rupturing its links with the East, [The Franks] were only too glad to accept whatever of its patrimony…the Greco-Roman world at large could offer them.'[32] A more accurate assessment might be to see a Greek Christianity in the hellenized centres of the East, a Latin Church exemplified by Rome and the Latin-speaking regions of Italy, and a Frankish Church in Gaul, northern Italy and Germania, drawing from a common theological heritage in the first six ecumenical councils but developing it along distinct lines. The Frankish line comes out of the Latin, but the two are eventually reintegrated in the tenth and eleventh centuries. To put the matter simply, Romanides' historical theory rests on a base that is ultimately fantasy. However, despite the peculiarity of his historical reconstruction, Romanides' influence should not be understated, particularly his impact on Orthodox living in the West and even on non-Orthodox scholars.[33]

Considering the origins of the Slavophile movement and its influence on the neo-Patristic school, both with their rejection of all things Western, it is interesting to note a parallel timeline within Western Rite Orthodoxy. Khomiakov began his theological work on *sobornost* and Slavophilism in the 1830's and developing coherence in the 1850's while Overbeck makes his initial approach to the Russian Orthodox Church in 1864. Both Slavophilia and neo-Patristic thought would lead to Orthodoxy down a road where not only was the West forgotten, it was often rejected outright as something alien to Orthodoxy or, where the West was accepted in whole or part, it was often reinterpreted to the point that Western fathers are devout hellenists who are misunderstood by unworthy successors, especially in Romanides' skewed vision. So we may confidently conclude

---

[30] John S. Romanides, *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine: An Interplay Between Theology and Society* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1981), 60.

[31] Though Romanides would say that this 'evidence' is flawed because it is buys in to the Frankish mythology that the Franks and the West Romans shared a theological lineage distinct from the Byzantine East (see Romanides, *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine*, 63, 69).

[32] Nichols, *Light From the East: Authors and Themes in Orthodox Theology* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1995), 79-80.

[33] Demacopoulos and Papanikolaou, 'Augustine and the Orthodox', *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, 5 n.75.

that Johnson is mistaken when he states Orthodoxy has a Western memory: English and icons of St Bede do not make a Western memory if they are detached from the historical context and proper perspective.

There is another type of psychological negativism which permeates the Byzantine rite, and that is the negativism that comes from converts. In responding to Sopko, Gregory Dye finds himself free of the psychological negativism that permeates Byzantine rite Orthodox,[34] but there is an existing negativism which comes from being disillusioned with one's former Church and habits of life which is, in some ways, common of all converts regardless of when or how long ago they converted. Many within the Western Rite Orthodox display this sort of negativism as well, though unlike Dye they do not abjure their former habits of worship. Such hostility is perhaps understandable since many who leave one church in favour of another do so because of some deficiency, real or perceived, in the former group. Sometimes, this hostility can fade but just as frequently it can remain seething beneath the surface until it is released in open attack on former associations; this is especially true when the one leaving the group feels that they are being forced out in some way or have been betrayed by the group itself, either because of changes to demographics, purpose, or beliefs of the group. While not the same as the ethnically based 'psychological negativism' that Sopko describes, it can not only be every bit as blinding to the affected individual, it can also be used to feed the assumptions and ideas of those how possess Sopko's negativism. However, despite Dye's protestations to the contrary, not having been Orthodox all of one's life does not free one from psychological negativism; rather, it merely makes them susceptible to different varieties of negativism with a pseudo-legitimate air about them on the assumption that converts must have some special insider knowledge.[35]

---

[34] Gregory H. M. Dye, 'Notes and Comments: Some Perspectives on the Western Rite – II', *SVTQ* 26.2 (1982) 125.

[35] For further critique of converts and the unique challenges they bring to churches which they convert to, see, Joseph D. Honeycutt, *One Flew Over the Onion Dome* (Salisbury: Regina Orthodox Press, 2006). The negativism that converts can bring when discussing their former memberships is not to be overlooked. Particularly for those converts coming to Western Rite Orthodoxy, there is frequently a sense of betrayal and not a little bit of bitterness against their former churches. Many convert parishes and clergy came to Orthodoxy from Anglicanism after The Episcopal Church's decision to ordain women in 1977. It may also be borne in mind that Stratman was himself a convert to the Orthodox Church.

Ultimately, the best response to the assertion that Orthodoxy does not need a Western rite is not to argue the point of necessity; from the standpoint of the Orthodox, the Church does not need anything that has not already been provided to her and if something was abandoned along the way, it is because it was not necessary. But, to dismiss Western Rite Orthodoxy on the question of necessity ignores that there are larger questions at stake, not only about Western Christianity but also about the Orthodox Church more generally. Furthermore, simply to dismiss the West and all things Western ignore the West's contribution to Christianity, as does caricaturising its history as Romanides does. It is this superficiality that Sopko is attempting to get at, however ineptly; it is also the same lack of depth that Johnson attempts to rebut while simultaneously succumbing to the same. For his part, Schmemann is certainly correct that there are issues more significant Western Rite Orthodoxy that are yet unraised. Certainly, some are likely to have such an immediate and uncritical reaction, but those are hardly individuals who are likely to take opportunity to make a critique of the Byzantine tradition to the same degree that Schmemann does in other places.[36] Thus, the lack of necessity seems insufficient grounds for summarily dismissing Western Rite Orthodoxy and should be set aside.

Lack of Liturgical Continuity

In arguing that the Western rite is acceptable in an abstract sense, nevertheless it is '[Schmemann's] deeply rooted conviction that the Eastern liturgical tradition is *alone* today in having preserved…the fullness of the Church's *lex orandi*.'[37] As he does in other places, Schmemann argues that Western Rite Orthodoxy is problematic because it lacks a history of continuous use in the Orthodox Church. This particular criticism is found more bluntly in Stratman's claim that the Christian West has been in a state of abject heresy for so long that

> the Western peoples have no rightful traditions; none whatsoever….The Latin Church, having lost the Grace of the Holy Spirit, also lost the ability

[36] Cf. Schmemann's three part series in *SVSQ* on the problems of Orthodoxy in America: 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America I: The Canonical Problem' *SVSQ* 8.2 (1964) 67-85; 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America II: The Liturgical Problem' *SVSQ* 8.4 (1964) 164-185; and 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America III: The Spiritual Problem' *SVSQ* 9.4 (1965) 171-194.
[37] Schmemann, 'Reflections on "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 268.

> to unerringly distinguish good from evil, or truth from falsehood. Hence she is entirely devoid of the ability to determine which of her traditions are 'rightful' and which are not. One thousand years of heresy have deprived the Western peoples of all pretensions to claim anything as their own. If any of them come to the Church of Christ seeking admittance, they cannot assume the role of Christian equals seeking re-admittance….[38]

While Stratman's suggestion is certainly offensive at first glance, it does reflect the attitude of Orthodox ecclesiology as it has developed through the past several centuries, specifically there is one Church and it is objectively identifiable with the canonical boundaries of the Orthodox Church. Nothing which exists outside of this Church is the Church. Those outside the Church may be Christians, they may certainly be schismatics or even heretics, but any indication that they constitute a separate Church is absolutely mistaken. To be a Church rather than an ecclesiological group, one must possess the Holy Spirit which unifies the faithful into a single body,[39] and to leave the Church in anyway would a definitive break in that unity, such that conceivably anyone returning to the Church would require reception of the Holy Spirit a second time.[40] A more extreme view would be that 'outside the Orthodox Church there is simply undifferentiated darkness in which the Pope is no different than a witchdoctor.'[41]

Thus, the critique against the lack of liturgical continuity is as much about the Western rite as it is about Orthodox ecclesiology. The liturgical critique is rather simple to answer as there is a ready example of Orthodox liturgies which do not have wide continuity but are still celebrated, most notably JAS. Though once a prominent liturgy in the East, for a number of centuries has only been celebrated in Jerusalem and on the Greek island of Zakynthos, and then only on 23 October, the feast day of St James, and 26 December or the first Sunday after Christmas.[42] More recently, JAS has made a resurgence within the Orthodox world, celebrated on the saint's festival, though now outside of its historical boundaries. There is little evidence that the resurge in practice is being met with theological or canonical opposition, though instances of the liturgy's

[38] Stratman, 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy', 2.
[39] Pomazansky, *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, 234-7.
[40] David Petras, 'Ecumenical Status of the Eastern Catholic Churches', *GOTR* 37.3-4 (1992) 357.
[41] Erickson 'Reception of Non-Orthodox Clergy Into the Orthodox Church', *SVTQ* 29.2 (1985) 131.
[42] Of course, the Syriac Orthodox Church uses JAS as its primary liturgy, though there are several variations with the version commonly used by the Orthodox Church.

celebration are still relatively sparse.[43] However, the argument from JAS, though interesting, is largely superficial and the parallels that do exist are not very precise.[44]

The underlying ecclesiological problem is more difficult to address, but it is of substantively greater importance in overcoming this particular criticism. We have already noted that the primary complaint that Stratman and others make is that the West, and by extension everything associated with the West, has lost all legitimacy and so the present circumstance is as if there had never been a Western rite,[45] presenting a liturgical version of 'the Pope is a witchdoctor' argument Erickson criticizes above. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that such a notion, while perfectly reasonable when ecclesiology is considered abstractly or used in intra- and inter-ecclesial polemics, does very little when the practical reality is introduced. Certainly, the Pope is not a witchdoctor, which would presume that the Bishop of Rome and those in communion with him have absolutely no notion of the Gospel or even knowledge of Jesus Christ, let alone the significance of his name.

The current problem is related to the same problem the Orthodox Church faces ecumenically: how, if the Orthodox Church is the One True Church without division, are non-Orthodox Christian communities to be understood?[46] St Cyprian taught that outside the boundaries of the Church, that is, the communion with the local bishop, there was no Church,[47] and thus no sacraments outside the Church.[48] If someone would establish another community separate from the bishop then this community was not the Church, whatever else it may have been. By contrast, Augustine's ecclesiology dictates that the Church can be found outside of its visible, canonical limits since the Holy Spirit is operative where God wills.[49] Stratman argues for a definitively Cyprianist ecclesiology,

---

[43] There are probably a number of factors at work against a popular resurgence of JAS: it is a relatively lengthy rite (five hours if celebrated fully and at a sufficiently contemplative pace), more repetitious than the prevailing CHR or BAS, and the day prescribed for its use (23 October) only occurs on Sunday infrequently, none of which can serve to aid its popularity.

[44] The same could also be said of references to the Liturgy of St Peter as a 'western rite' in continual use of the Orthodox Church. The Liturgy of St Peter is the normal Byzantine liturgy with the Roman canon in place of the CHR anaphora. Whether this can be described as a 'western rite' is debatable, as is the extent of its use.

[45] Stratman, 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy', 2.

[46] John Zizioulas, 'Orthodox Ecclesiology and the Ecumenical Movement', *Sourozh* 21.1 (1985) 20-23.

[47] Cyprian of Carthage, *Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae* 3 *PL* 4, 497 3.

[48] Cyprian, *Liber de Uniate Ecclesiae* 11, *PL* 4, 508.

[49] Zizioulas, 'Orthodox Ecclesiology', *Sourozh* 21.1 (1985) 2.

but Zizioulas and Erickson are by no means certain that a strict interpretation of Cyprian is necessarily Orthodox. This question does not just affect the Western rite; it is most keenly felt in Orthodox participation in ecumenical gatherings. Zizioulas sets the boundaries of the Church at what he calls the 'baptismal limit',[50] and Stratman would perhaps assent to that perspective. The problem then is what constitutes real baptism, or more generally, real sacraments. While ecumenical encounters have attempted to define baptism as a rite of the Church administered in water in the name of the Holy Trinity,[51] this still raises the question of whether or not non-Orthodox can administer the sacraments licitly, a question which is by no means settled within Orthodoxy. A commonly retold story, though it is perhaps apocryphal, involves a group of Greek bishops being asked by a group of Anglican bishops whether or not the Orthodox would consider the Anglicans to be baptized. After conferring among themselves, the Orthodox simply replied that they didn't know. Erickson concurs that Orthodox have insufficiently come to grips with how to understand sacraments performed outside the canonical boundaries of the Church.[52]

For the present objection to the Western rite, it is perhaps best to state that it represents only one part of Orthodox ecclesiology; it is by no means the last word. What is problematic about the 'witch doctor' approach employed by Stratman and others is that it assumes that the West has no Christian heritage, no Christian culture, and is wholly unfamiliar with the Gospel. Others who argue that the Byzantine rite was sufficient for the Slavs and Kievan Rus to adopt despite having a different culture also miss the point that the situation in the modern West is one of a pre-existing Christian culture and not of a Christian culture overcoming or enhancing a pagan one. A mere look around will demonstrate that the West has at least some familiarity with Christianity, even if that familiarity is becoming progressively weaker. The other theory is more emotive than evocative, since it ignores the fundamental difference between the modern West and pre-Christian Russia, while simultaneously ignoring the complex political, social, and

[50] Ibid., 22-23.
[51] World Council of Churches Faith and Order Commission, Paper No. 111, 'Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry' §V.17, 1982.
[52] Erickson, 'Reception of Non-Orthodox Clergy into the Orthodox Church', *SVTQ* 29.2 (1984) 115-32.

economic factors that lead the Slavs to associate with Byzantium rather than the West.[53] In this instance, the problem is not so much the Western rite abstractly as a lack of definitive ecclesiology which can effectively grapple with the problem of long-term schism.

The Western Rite is Divisive

Jurisdictionally, the situation in North America might best be described as highly irregular; more directly, it is an absolute mess. In an ideal situation, each city should have one hierarch overseeing a territorially cohesive diocese, with one among their number from the larger, territorially cohesive region chosen as their primate, or first of equals and represent the territory to the governing synod of a 'mother church' elsewhere or speak for the local Church to the rest of the Orthodox world on her own accord. In North America, there are nine overlapping canonical jurisdictions, some with their own synod, some consisting of a single bishop reporting back to the motherland, some under the presidency of another jurisdiction, and one church claiming autocephaly. On the basis of this confused situation, many object to the Western rite because it is simply one more instance of division where there are already enough divisions and is potentially a bar to solving the jurisdictional chaos.[54]

At times, the argument against the legitimacy of the Western rite can be rendered counter-intuitively. For example, Johnson comments that 'the "western rite" can only impede the progress of the Orthodox Church towards reaching a goal of unity within ethnic diversity.'[55] One is left to wonder what sort of 'ethnic diversity' is envisioned for American Orthodoxy. In stating that the primary need of the Orthodox Church in North America is unity, Johnson is no doubt thinking of unity which supersedes ethnic jurisdictions among Orthodox Christians. Specifically, he would perhaps be quick to state that what is needed is not a 'Greek Orthodox' Church, or an 'Antiochian Orthodox' Church or a 'Russian Orthodox' Church, but an Orthodox Church of a unified hierarchy

[53] Cf. Alexis P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom*, 13-85.
[54] Metropolitan Kallistos' concerns regarding the Western rite are also founded in his fear that the introduction of the Western rite in the United Kingdom would only add to the fragmentation already present though he also finds the Gallican rite to be a 'moving and prayerful event' (see 'Some Thoughts on "Western Rite" Orthodoxy', *The Priest* 5.5 (1996). <<http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/westernrite/ware.html>>
[55] Johnson, 'The Western Rite', *The Priest* 5.5 (1995).

across ethnic lines, such that the Nicene ideal of 'one city, one bishop' could in fact be realized within American Orthodoxy. This is perhaps what he means by unity within ethnic diversity: specifically hierarchical unity. And yet, Western Rite Orthodoxy is not one more faction of overlapping jurisdiction competing for 'turf' but is integrated into the diocesan structure of the jurisdictions where it is found. Certainly, more could be done in this regard,[56] but the rite itself is not administratively divisive. In this way, the Western rite actually functions as an example of how divergent liturgical traditions can co-exist under a single episcopal structure. If Eastern bishops can preside over a Western rite liturgy which differs so significantly from the normal rite they are accustomed to, then jurisdictional unity should be no problem since all other instances of Orthodoxy in North America celebrate the same rite.[57]

Where the Western rite has the potential to become divisive is in the practical implementation which does not have a broad-based consensus. Certainly, the manner in which the Western rite has come about has created animosity between some Eastern rite clergy and the AWRV.[58] The most famous incident involves an exchange between Paul Schneirla, then AWRV Vicar-General and Anthony Gergiannakis, then Greek Orthodox Bishop of San Francisco. The incident revolved around the latter's issuing of a pastoral encyclical dated October 4, 1995 which described the Western rite as 'foreign element within the Body of Christ' and 1) prohibited Western rite clergy from receiving communion in parishes of his diocese unless vested according to the Eastern rite, 2) prohibited concelebration with or 'participation' in Western rite liturgies, and 3) discouraged laity from participation in pan-Orthodox activities which included a Western

[56] See Chapter 11 below.

[57] This is obviously an oversimplification since there are distinct variances in the rite between jurisdictions based on geographic point of origin for particular jurisdiction or parish. However, even that taken into consideration, there are also variations within the Byzantine rite as it is celebrated from parish to parish within the same jurisdiction based on a number of local factors. However, many commentators on this subject like to speak of the relative uniformity of the Byzantine rite as an expression of faith so that one is left with the initial impression that such variations are of little consequence and could be easily accommodated for, certainly with much greater ease than any accommodation of the Western rite. For examples, see Grisbrooke 'The Eastern Rite in the Western Parish', *SVSQ* 9.2 (1965) 75-83 and P. Meyendorff 'The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy in America', *SVTQ* 40.1 (1996) 43-64.

[58] There is also the potential for conflict between various expressions of the Western rite. Most leaders in the AWRV are suspicious of the reconstructed Sarum and Gallican forms, and those using reconstructed forms tend to be hostile towards the AWRV and those using similar liturgical forms in the ROCOR. While this is certainly divisive, there are also other pre-existing divisions which factor into these conflicts (e.g., conflict over the calendar question or ecumenism in the parent jurisdiction) and conflict over liturgical use is an extension of the larger problem, not the problem in itself.

rite component.[59] What followed was an undignified response by Schneirla and an equally undignified reply from Bishop Anthony on the subject of the Western rite and the proper place within the life of the Church.[60]

What makes the above significant is that it is the only time that concelebration has been forbidden between Western rite clergy and the clergy of another Orthodox Church. Certainly, there have been instances where concelebration has been forbidden with the ECOF, but in all of these cases, there was also a severing of communion between the two churches, whereas Bishop Anthony merely placed restrictions on how Western rite clergy could receive communion in his diocese, but without simultaneously declaring a breech in relations with the Antiochian Archdiocese. On the other hand, this is not the only instance of concelebration being suspended with a single subsection of an archdiocese, as Metropolitan Philip did much the same with parishes of the Jerusalem Patriarchate in North America[61] and continued the suspension when those parishes were transferred to the canonical authority of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in August of 2008.[62] Both instances may be considered a product of the canonical situation in North America rather than a problem of unique to the Western rite per se, As with the preceding objection, the problem is not the Western rite itself, but with Orthodox ecclesiology, specifically with Orthodox in North America having abandoned a proper ecclesiology.[63]

However, it is clear that at least for some parts of North American Orthodoxy, the Western rite presents itself as an undesirable element to many clergy of the various Orthodox jurisdictions. What remains to be seen is if this undesirability comes from a lack of understanding of the Western rite or from a particular ecclesiology such as

---

[59] 'Protocol Number 3' Bishop Anthony (Gergiannakis) of San Francisco. 4 October 1995. <<http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html>>

[60] See also Schneirla, 'Letter to Bishop Anthony Gergiannakis', 05 January 1996. <<http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html>>; and Bishop Anthony 'Letter to Paul Schneirla', 22 January 1996. <<http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html>>

[61] Metropolitan Philip (Saliba), 'Archpastoral Directive' 2 May 2003. Metropolitan Philip suspended relations with all Jerusalem Patriarchate clergy assigned to North America, though not clergy visiting or assigned to the Patriarchal territory. The suspension was related the Patriarchate's recent acceptance of several clergy who had been suspended and excommunicated during the events at Sts Peter and Paul Church in Ben Lomond, California.

[62]Metropolitan Philip (Saliba), 'Archpastoral Directive on the Vicariate for Palestinian-Jordanian Communities in the USA' 07 August 2008. <<http://www.antiochian.org/files/8-7-08%20Re%20GOA%20Palestinian%20Vicariate.pdf>>. It is worthwhile to note that the situations were distinct, as some of the parishes were served by priests who had not received canonical release from or are under suspension by the Antiochian Archdiocese.

[63] Zizioulas, 'Orthodox Ecclesiology', *Sourozh* 21.1 (1985), 24-25.

outlined by Stratman. Without knowing either answer, it is difficult to suggest concretely how this objection might be played out in a practical form. There is also the popular association of Orthodoxy with particular ethnicities which has yet to be overcome, and is something which should not be taken lightly. It was not long ago that a non-Greek coming to a Greek Orthodox Church would have drawn curious looks; in many places, this is still the case. While the Antiochian Archdiocese and OCA have done an admirable job of evangelizing and assimilating converts, other jurisdictions are still wary of converts, particularly those who want be ordained to the priesthood, since they are not of the same culture as their flocks and that they will inadvertently or deliberately oppose the dominant parish culture.[64]

The Western rite is not a neutral factor in any future pan-Orthodox jurisdiction in North America, but it is not an immediate problem. Issues that are more significant include acceptance or rejection of the OCA's autocephalous status by other autocephalous churches, the relationship a North American church would have with the Patriarch of Constantinople, how a North American primate would interact with his fellow hierarchs, and the role of a multi-ethnic hierarchy serving ethnic parishes. At less than ten percent of the total number of parishes within the Antiochian Archdiocese, the Western rite presents a potential problem that has been inflated far beyond its potential impact. For that matter, provided the 'big' issues mentioned above can be addressed, there seems to be no particular reason why the Western rite would be an impediment to pan-Orthodox unity, especially if they can be viewed as just one more ethnic constituency among a multitude of others.

Western Rite Churches are Reverse Uniates

Of the objections to Western Rite Orthodoxy, this is perhaps the most loaded of the charges because of the insinuation that goes along with the identification as 'Uniate.' Western Rite Orthodox protest that they are not uniates in reverse, despite having come from West to the East with their rites. Western Rite Orthodox argue that they do not

[64] Elpidophoros Lambriniadis, 'Challenges of Orthodoxy in America and the Role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate' address to Saint Andrew Clergy Brotherhood of the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Boston, 16 March 2009. <<http://www.hchc.edu/holycross/about/news/news_releases/InauguralPatriarchateLecture.html>>

resemble the Eastern Catholic Churches, nor were they subject to the same forces that brought the Eastern Catholic Churches into existence.[65] To a point, this response is certainly correct. Western Rite Orthodox are not a *sui iuris* particular church under its own hierarchy, but are integrated into established Eastern rite dioceses under Eastern rite hierarchs. Even though there is a vicar general and a Western Rite Vicariate in the Antiochian Archdiocese, the vicar general has been a senior Eastern rite priest, Alexander Turner being the only Western rite incumbent. In addition, the role of the vicar is rather loosely defined such that his primary authority rests in determining liturgical matters, and seemingly little else. Other Western rite groups, whether in the ROCOR or Holy Synod of Milan, have no such equivalent office.[66] Further, unlike a *sui iuris* Church, they do not have their own canon law, nor has there even been significant consideration of how Eastern canon law applies in all instances to the Western rite. Part of this may be because the Western rite has historically been quite small and, unlike the Eastern Catholic Churches, was not constituted by one or more bishops deciding to join with their dioceses.

Nevertheless, there are similarities between the two designations. They are minority movements within their own communions where distinction from the majority is based primarily on possessing a unique liturgical life. Both groups have experienced varying degrees of hostility because of their distinct liturgical life, both from their own communion and from the outside groups with whom they share origins or similarities. Both groups have suffered from pressure to change their liturgical life to introduce elements from the dominate faction in the communion. Both are sometimes looked upon as ecclesial traitors by the communions they left. On the other hand, there are some important differences as well. Eastern Catholics are most often churches in their own right, with a separate hierarchy and distinct, though complementary, system of canon law. Western Rite Orthodoxy, with the exception of the Church of France, is subject to

[65] Cf., e.g., Benjamin Johnson, 'Western Rite is not "Reverse Uniatism"' *Western Orthodox Blog*, 12 May 2006. <http://westernorthodox.blogspot.com/2007/05/western-rite-is-not-reverse-uniatism.html>>. The assumptions about the origins of the Eastern Catholic Churches are somewhat simplified, but the other comparisons made are understandable.

[66] However, as of 2009, all Western rite institutions in the ROCOR are under the direct authority of Metropolitan Hilarion, which effectively meant making Christminster in Hamilton, Ontario a stavropegial foundation, as St Petroc was already under the Metropolitan's direct authority in his role as Archbishop of Sydney.

Eastern canon law, is integrated into the local hierarchy, and cannot be said in any way to constitute a separate local church from the existing Eastern Rite Orthodoxy. Western Rite Orthodox have primarily come to the Orthodox Church from their own initiative and not by means of coercion, deceit, or bribery.[67]

The problem with this criticism is not so much the accuracy of its claim: indeed, Schneirla points out that 'whatever Church politicians may say, implicit in uniatism is a claim to be the one Church.'[68] The problem is the emotionally loaded implication of the label Uniate.[69] And considering how the term has often been used pejoratively against Eastern Catholics by Eastern Orthodox, it seems as no surprise that Western Rite Orthodox would object to what is essentially an emotional appeal. Where Western Rite Orthodoxy is similar to the Eastern Catholic Churches, the similarity is largely a superficial one, based on the fact that both groups are relatively minor, ritually distinct communities within an otherwise liturgically homogeneous communion. But the historic criticisms against the Eastern Catholic Churches, and which caused the designation uniate to become pejorative, have less to do with ritual use as they do with ancestral betrayal and deceptive proselytism, criticisms which would be misplaced if directed against Western Rite Orthodox by their Eastern rite counterparts.

Conclusions

The majority of objections that have been put forward against the Western rite are substantively weak. Some of them make assumptions which are simply untrue or provide implications which are unsustainable. Others attempt to bait and switch the careless reader into agreeing with the objections by appealing to emotional sensitivities to hide a

[67] This, of course, must be qualified. Not all Eastern Catholics have become Eastern Catholic through the means listed above. Among the Eastern Catholic Churches, the Italo-Albanian, Maronite, and Syro-Malabar churches all claim to have never knowingly broken communion with Rome. This does not mean than unscrupulous tactics were not used to bring about or enforce union in some locales, only that one cannot state that all Eastern Catholics were originally forced into union with Rome against their will. It should also be remembered that in Ukraine, Russia was not adverse to deceptively or forcibly returning Eastern Catholic parishes to union with Moscow, especially following the Polish Uprising of 1831. See Barbara Skinner, *The Western Front of the Eastern Church*: *Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in Eighteenth Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009).

[68] Schneirla, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Brief Response From Within', *SVTQ* 45.2 (2001) 196.

[69] As an Eastern Catholic described it in private conversation, 'uniate' is the ecclesiological equivalent of using a racial slur. The direct equivalency has some unique problems, but visceral reaction it evokes is, again as described to this author, is similar.

poorly reasoned position. Superficially, the arguments seem to make reasonable points against the Western rite, but the objections say as much about the state of Orthodoxy in the West as they do regarding the Western rite in any direct way. This is not to say that there are no valid arguments against Western Rite Orthodoxy as it has been constituted, nor is this an apologia for the Western rite. Rather, the above is merely an observation that many of the objections to Western Rite Orthodoxy that are commonly employed lack genuine substance and in many ways prevents addressing genuine problems posed by the Western rite. It is those problems that are the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 10
PROBLEMS IN WESTERN RITE ORTHODOXY

Unlike the critiques of the previous chapter, the criticisms which follow are both my own and are of how Western Rite Orthodoxy, especially within the AWRV, has been implemented and developed. Some of the criticisms do strike at the foundational assumptions and scholarship of the AWRV, but the more significant ones question the sometimes haphazard inclusion of Western Rite Orthodoxy into the Eastern Church. Furthermore, these are not arguments against the Western rite in theory but rather are attempts to point out substantive problems that Western Rite Orthodoxy has in practice. Some of these issues are deep structural problems that need to be fully addressed as soon as possible and with as broad a consensus as possible while others point to a flaw in the foundation of the AWRV's Western rite.

The Academic Problem

Western Rite Orthodoxy in the AWRV did not arise in a critical vacuum, but has been the subject of critical investigation by specialists from the outset.[1] Ideally, this would mean individuals who are both well versed in the history of the Western liturgies and Orthodox theology. At least from the theological side John Meyendorff and Alexander Schmemann were attached to the first Western Rite Commission.[2] From the liturgical side, there was in fact no one with any specific knowledge of the intricacies of the Western rite as a liturgical phenomenon, perhaps with the expectation that those who would become clergy in the Western rite would be sufficiently well versed in their own

[1] Anthony Bashir, 'Thirteenth Annual Convention: The Western Rite', *The Word* 2.11 (1958) 16.
[2] Schmemann is certainly a capable liturgy, but most of his work was focused on the Byzantine rite rather than the Western rite. He was clearly aware of the theoretical currents present in the liturgical movement and sympathized with their efforts at liturgical renewal (*Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 11-3).

rite's history and theology and therefore effectively aid in the process of producing an Orthodox Western rite.

Even at the present time, there remains a lack of Western liturgical specialists for the Western rite, at least a lack of individuals who possess recognized credentials for the study of the Western liturgy.[3] Thus, the majority of scholarly research into the Western rite, either historically for the purpose of making it conform to Orthodox theology or presently for the purpose of apologia within and outside of the Orthodox Church, has been *ad hoc*, undertaken by clergy with only a basic seminary education or by laity who can best be described as amateurs. This creates a problem for the Western rite in that its scholarship is often suspect, and sometimes downright erroneous, making claims which no liturgical scholar would uphold in present practice. Arguing against Bishop Anthony Gergiannakis assertion that the Tridentine rite is the result of 'sixteenth century reformation and counter-reformation debates',[4] Connely states as his apologia that 'it is a simple matter to compare the *Orthodox Missal* (1995) containing the Western Rite Liturgy of today, with the vast tradition of old Roman Missals from the time of the Sacramentary of St Gregory [590]',[5] and goes on to state that the differences are relatively minor, including the use of English, commemoration of the Patriarch of Antioch, and the addition of a descending epiclesis, all elements discussed in Chapter 8.

---

[3] This is not to suggest that there are no individuals within the Western Rite who possess an advanced education. Father Michael Trigg was a recipient of a D.Phil. in Anthropology from the University of Oxford, studying under Edward Evans-Pritchard (an anthropologist noted for his work in comparative religion). However, that does not mean Trigg or other individuals who are commonly put forward b apologists for the Western rite (notably Connelly, Fenton, and Hughes) possess the requisite knowledge of the present state of liturgical studies to lend justification to their claims. One blogger, on the news that Hughes had been appointed to be Vicar General of the AWRV, noted that Hughes is 'a real liturgical expert; the kind with a degree' (<<http://www.westernorthodox.blogspot.com>>, retrieved on 8 December 2008) though the degree that he possesses is an M.Div. from St Vladimir's Seminary, the same degree most Eastern rite clergy in the Antiochian Archdiocese possess as well. Inflating the qualifications of AWRV clergy, particularly those who are in a position to speak for the whole, seems to be a tactic to silence critics of their liturgical practice, some of whom do not possess any advanced degrees. However, from this author's perspective, this is insufficient evidence of liturgical expertise or theological education for AWRV apologists. Granted, the precise definition of adequate academic credentials is debatable but I do not think that insisting on a research-based postgraduate degree (with or without a taught component) in religion or theology rather than a professional degree (like a M.Div.) as evidence of 'expertise' is unduly rigorous.

[4] Bishop Anthony (Gergiannakis), 'Protocol No. 3', 4 October 1995. <<http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html>> (accessed 14 March 2009).

[5] Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 4. Connely shifts between using brackets and parentheses for dates, and his original format has been retained in all direct quotations. The reader will note that any brackets are original unless otherwise specified.

But Connely's assertion that there are no differences between early Roman liturgical books and *TOM* deserves further investigation. In the first place, his assertion that the Gregorian Sacramentary dates to the time of St Gregory the Great is at the very least unsubstantiated, in part because the earliest sacramentary that bears the designation 'Gregorian' is *Cameracensis 164*, which was used by Deshusses as his base for the critical edition of the text and which dates to ca. 811-812; and while St Gregory may have authored some prayer formulas, the entirety of the text is not his composition.[6] There are earlier prayer formulas, including the Gelasian Sacramentary, but none in their extant form approaching the time of St Gregory. Aside from that, the sacramentaries (with the exception of the so-called Verona Sacramentary) contain the variable parts of the liturgy (the propers) rather than those portions which are fixed (the ordinary or *ordo*), though the Gregorian Sacramentary has a narrative description of the mass which is sometimes called a proto-ordo.[7] The *ordo missae* from the early period are most normally found in *libelli*, small books or single pages which combine the *ordo* with limited rubrics. There are *libelli* circulated for both Roman and Gallican forms,[8] with the Verona Sacramentary being a collection of *libelli* dating from perhaps as early as ca. 561-574, though the extant copy is slightly later.[9] The most important of these *ordines* is *Ordo Romanus I*, which describes the solemn pontifical mass.[10] While it is indeed similar to the formulary in *TOM*, there are notable differences in that it includes additional prayers (such as to the reserved sacrament during the entrance procession) and omits other elements (like the creed). If we presume that the *ordo* is a simple matter for comparison, then we can see that Connely demonstrates a lack of familiarity with the texts he references.

The lack of scholarship becomes more apparent when subject is the Tikhonite liturgy. Here Connely revisits the notion that the *BCP* liturgy (and consequently, TIK) represents a separate liturgical tradition in the form of the Ephesine liturgy.[11] The

---

[6] Folsom 'The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite' in Chupungo (ed.), *HSL* I, 251-4. See also See also Vogler, *Medieval Liturgy*, 31-106.
[7] Pierce, 'Evolution of the *ordo missae*' in Laron-Miller (ed.), *Medieval Liturgy*, 4.
[8] Ibid., 4-5.
[9] Folsom 'The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite' *HLS* I, 245-6.
[10] A recent, in-depth study of *Ordo Romanus Primus* can be found in Romano 'Ritual and Society in Early Medieval Rome'.
[11] Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 2.

concept of an Ephesine origin for the English liturgy was first developed by Anglicans who wished to demonstrate the antiquity of the English rites as independent of the Roman rite specifically, as well as the historic independence of the Church of England from the Church of Rome generally.[12] It was proposed that the Celtic, Gallican, and Ambrosian rites could all be traced to a single rite imported to the city of Lyons from Ephesus, perhaps via Ireneaus.[13] Connely's argument is essentially a restatement of Blunt's proposition regarding the history of the liturgy. To be more direct, Connely is directly copying Blunt here, to the point that his work would be considered plagiarism in an academic context. Much of his argument regarding the ancient history of the liturgy, including a section on the Roman rite, is taken directly from *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer* with only minor amendment.[14] The problem is not so much the lack of attribution, grave though it is, but the sheer volume of text which is taken and presented as his own work; most work by Western rite apologists is rather thinly sourced to begin with, but there is not even any effort to reference Blunt in any manner. Perhaps it is a minor point, but it does demonstrate a deficit of scholarly training at best of blatant disregard for the norms of scholarship at the worst.

Equally troubling are the comments Connely makes regarding the history of the prayerbook and the extent that TIK is affected by the Reformed nature of the liturgy, as stated by Bishop Anthony. Here, Connely states that '[The Tikhonite] Liturgy, like that of St Gregory, is unrelated to the "Reformation and Counter-Reformation debates." Even a casual examination of the text will reveal little in common with the Eucharistic Liturgy (Order of Holy Communion) in the various editions, 1549, 1552, 1559, 1662, of the English *Book of Common Prayer*.'[15] In one sense, Connely is correct in that that TIK

---

[12] Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church*, 29.

[13] Though different from Connely thesis, Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 326-7, concluded that the Mozarabic and Gallican rites were Syrian importations, though Spinks, *Western Use and Abuse of Eastern Liturgical Tradition*, 25, concludes that he is mistaken, and that these rites were originally imported from North Africa and not the Christian East.

[14] Compare Blunt *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, 345-6 with Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 2-4. I was personally very shocked to make this discovery, especially since Connely's work has been available via the internet for the better part of a decade and is widely disseminated by Western Rite Orthodox sites. It was a very surreal, *Wizard of Oz* kind of moment: 'pay no attention to the man behind the curtain'.

[15] Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 8. Of course, this begs the question of why there would be a need for TIK as opposed to GRE if the two liturgies are so similar, a point taken up in Chapter 12 below; for his part,

theoretically owes its origins to the 1928 American *BCP*, not to the English prayerbook directly. Yet, for all the considerations of how the American prayerbook was created, there are two fundamentally unstated points: first, though the American prayerbook is heavily indebted to the Scottish prayerbook, it is even more indebted to the 1662 English prayerbook, and second, that TIK is derived not from the prayerbook itself, but from *The Anglican Missal*, the American version of which is derived from the English version, which is a modification of the 1662 English *BCP* in an case. The 1662 English *BCP* is certainly a product of the Reformation, particularly considering that Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine underlies the text of the 1549 prayerbook; despite the rejection of Cranmer's doctrine in the Elizabethan Settlement, '[the Church of England] has continuously had to use a liturgy which was quite brilliantly designed to express those particular notions,'[16] which are commonly regarded as Zwinglian in their essential form.[17] Nowhere is this more evident in the distribution of communion in the 1662 English *BCP*, which maintains the memorialist administration formula which is characteristic of Zwingli's eucharistic theology in particular.[18] Considering this administration form was retained in *The Anglican Missal* and TIK, Connely's claim that TIK remains unaffected by the Reformation rings hollow.

Ultimately, as one of the AWRV's most able and vocal apologist at the present, Connely presents himself as a knowledgeable scholar but proves himself a rank amateur; it certainly throws doubt on other AWRV's implicit claim of reasonable scholarship and fidelity to authentic Western orthodox tradition by association. Consequently, history and scholarship are seemingly only useful as a club to bludgeon opponents of the Western rite and may be dispensed with if they become unhelpful; the problems with this approach are self-evident.

The Liturgical Problem

Connely does not seem to not the irony in his statement referenced above as he seeks to defend TIK as an Orthodox liturgy.

[16] Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: SPCK, 1958), xiii.

[17] Jeanes, 'Cranmer and Common Prayer' in Fefling and Shattuck (eds.), *Oxford Guide to the* Book of Common Prayer, 32-3.

[18] William P. Stevens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 227-35.

The problem of liturgical scholarship is not simply an abstract difficulty because it has a direct affect on the life of Western Rite Orthodoxy, providing it with one of its most prominent features in the rejection of the liturgies of the Western churches as revised following Vatican II. This opposition to the reformed rites served as the *raison d'être* for Western Rite Orthodox parishes formed in the late twentieth. The major apologetic works of the AWRV attempt to demonstrate this discontinuity with the historic Western liturgy represented by the Missal of Paul VI and its associated Protestant forms.[19] Official literature from the AWRV maintains this hostility,[20] as do many parish histories (especially from parishes received into Orthodoxy before the end of the twentieth century), personal internet blogs, and listservs devoted to the Western rite. Most AWRV parishes were erected in the last century with the express purpose of maintaining the Tridentine rite or 1928 American *BCP*. Where the desire to become part of the true Church is mentioned, it is commonly given second place to open hostility to liturgical change. In a very real sense, this opposition to liturgical change represents the core thrust of Western Rite Orthodoxy, despite the claim that Western Rite Orthodox are not 'mere followers of an ideology or "ism" – not even "Anglicanism" or "traditionalism". We are not members of a movement or a protest, nor are we a special interest religious lobby…we have moved beyond such endeavors'.[21]

In their rejection of *NOM*, Western Rite Orthodox share many common characteristics with Traditionalist Catholics and Continuing Anglicans, particularly in their appraisal of the deficiencies of *NOM* and the superiority of the Tridentine rite, though these concerns are not always expressed in precisely the same manner, nor do all of the same concerns overlap. There are several works available which address the criticisms made by opponents the liturgical reforms, so there is no need for the present

[19] The literature of Western Rite Orthodoxy commonly refers to the revised liturgies as *Novus Orodo Missae* or simply *Novus Ordo* in a pejorative sense. This designation was used unofficially within the Roman Catholic Church, most notably in a speech of Paul IV on 24 May 1976. Despite its use as a pejorative term, both by Western Rite Orthodox and Traditionalist Catholics, and its lack of official ecclesiastical use and less pervasive academic use, the designation has been retained because it is a convenient short-hand for the *Missal of Paul IV*, the 1979 American *BCP*, and the *Lutheran Book of Worship*, though the present work will consistently employ the abbreviation *NOM* to designate these rites since it has less of the pejorative connotation of just *Novus Ordo*.

[20] Cf. for example AWRV, 'Moving to Western Rite Orthodoxy', 4, 14.

[21] Connely, 'Finding a Home in Western Rite Orthodoxy' in Trigg (ed.) *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 18.

study to undertake an exhaustive response to these critics.[22] However, inasmuch as these critiques form a part of the identity of Western Rite Orthodox, it is at least important to acknowledge their criticism and, where reasonable, provide some meaningful response. John Baldovin's recent book responding to critics of the new rites divides the apparent variety of critique into four categories: philosophical, historical, theological, and social/anthropological. His categorization is important for his own work, primarily because he is responding to critics who possess a holistic vision of the problems of liturgical reform, and in the case of his treatment of Catherine Pickstock and Klaus Gambler, what is wrong with modern society more generally.

Baldovin's categories are difficult to utilize with respect to Western rite Orthodox objections to *NOM*, primarily because Western rite apologists lack a holistic vision of what is wrong with the new liturgical rites. For many, the new rites are wrong simply because they are ostensibly so rather than due to any defect that can be articulated. This can be expected since, as we have already indicated, the proponents of Western rite Orthodoxy are primarily pastors rather than theologians or liturgists and so are perhaps unable to provide such sweeping vision. Occasionally, an approach towards a holistic vision is made, but often only in the form of brief snippets primarily surrounded by emotive complaint. Using Baldovin's categories, most of the complaints would fall into the historical and anthropological categories; though some of those critiques do have a dogmatic component, they are largely placed in historical terms so it is perhaps best to treat them under that heading. Additionally, the critiques as they have been expressed in the published writings of Western Rite Orthodox can be distilled into three distinct complaints: *NOM* represents a departure from the Western liturgical tradition; it is humanistic/modernistic rather than spiritual; and it is generally impious.[23]

The primary argument for the retention of the Tridentine rite is because there is a perceived break in continuity with the ancient liturgical tradition of the West on the part of *NOM*. Even the use of the designation 'Tridentine rite' is considered erroneous since it

---

[22] See Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2008); Botte, *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Reform* (Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1988); and Piero Marini, *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal 1963-1975* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2007), for example.

[23] However, this latter point is most often implied rather than explicitly stated.

indicates that GRE 'is no older than the Council of Trent [1545-1563].'[24] Connelly specifies that the only changes made to the rite in the Tridentine era (since the Council of Trent did not actually make any changes to the rite itself but left its modification to papal decree) were to standardize the rubrics and to suppress local uses of insufficient antiquity.[25] However, *NOM* is commonly regarded as having abandoned the historic Western liturgy in its entirety, thus placing it in a state of discontinuity. This is directly stated by Connely[26] and Mangels,[27] but is certainly implicit in the perspective of Paul Schneirla when he states that non-Orthodox Churches 'trash familiar worship patterns', among other grievances.[28] More gentle, but no less worrisome, are the comments of Bishop Basil Essey that the pre-Vatican II rites are '[a] beautiful and authentic tradition…in danger of dying out.'[29] Several questions immediately arise regarding the above perspective: how accurate is the assertion that the Tridentine rite is essentially continuous with the pre-Tridentine mass, how accurate is the assertion that *NOM* is essentially discontinuous with the Western liturgical tradition, and what make something 'continuous' or 'discontinuous'?

In some ways, the newer rites do represent a substantive break with the past since 'one certainly cannot deny the radical nature of a reform that swept away the use of a common language and simplified the liturgy to the extent that the *Missal of Paul VI* did.'[30] However, there is a distinction between saying the new rite was 'radical' in the sense of how people experienced the rite (in their own language, for example) and 'radical' in the sense that it represents a wholesale abandonment of the Western liturgical tradition, as Traditionalist Catholics and Western Rite Orthodox would claim. To demonstrate their point, most Western Rite Orthodox rely on one of several critics of the reform, notably Klaus Gambler who places the new rite in a state of direct discontinuity with the historic West and whom Baldovin treats at length.[31] Though Western Rite

[24] Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 4.
[25] Ibid., 4-5.
[26] Ibid., 6.
[27] John Mangels 'Orthodox Odyssey', *Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 20-2.
[28] Schneirla, 'Editorial: The Twain Meet', *The Word* 37.5 (1993) 3.
[29] Bishop Basil (Essey), 'Comments on the Western Rite'. <<http://www.westernorthodox.com/basil .html>>.
[30] Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 43.
[31] Ibid., 36-51.

Orthodox would overtly deny it, the evidence is clear that some sort of reform, indeed one that was radical, was necessary. Yet, even Western Rite Orthodox admit the validity of some of the reforms that took place immediately prior to 1969 when the Tridentine rite was abrogated, and nowhere is this better demonstrated in the liturgical books of the AWRV, especially in the Paschal rite. The Triduum has been altered in some places to conform to the norms issued by Pius XII, most notably that the Maundy Thursday and Good Friday liturgies are celebrated in the evening and late afternoon, respectively, rather than in the morning. The Good Friday liturgy also includes communion for the laity, but has preserved the solemn reproaches and prayers for 'the faithless Jews.' Likewise, the Easter Vigil has seen some elements reformed, such as celebration Saturday night rather than Saturday morning, use of a single paschal candle rather than the triple candlestick, and emphasis on the vigil as a baptismal rite, and other elements untouched. Likewise, Western Rite Orthodox communicates the faithful during the Mass, whereas before Vatican II the faithful were normally communicated at a side altar before or after Mass, usually from hosts consecrated at a previous Mass. This communion was always from the host: the laity simply did not receive the chalice, though Western Rite Orthodox communicate under both species. Western Rite Orthodox would find it obligatory to admit that some reform was essential, the question being how much reform is in fact necessary.

While making negative claims regarding *NOM*, Western rite Orthodox simultaneously present positive claims about the Tridentine rite, most of which are constructed to be the direct opposite of what is claimed for *NOM*: since *NOM* is a direct break with the Western liturgical tradition, the Tridentine rite stands in direct continuity (and we might add, at the end of) the same Western liturgical tradition. Since *NOM* reflects humanistic, modernist, and secularist values, the Tridentine rite reflects ancient and orthodox Christian values. Since *NOM* is impious and even 'ugly' in its celebration, the Tridentine rite is majestic, splendid and is the '[worship of] God in the beauty of holiness.'[32] The first point is at least worth examining in closer detail. Connely attacks those who situate the Gregorian rite into a Tridentine context, most notably the Bishop Anthony of San Francisco. Connely claims that

[32] Mangels 'Orthodox Odyssey', *Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 20.

> One of the myths currently circulating about the Rite of St Gregory the Great is that it is 'Tridentine' – i.e., it is no older than the Council of Trent [1545-1563]. This criticism is made by those who know nothing about either this Rite or the Council Trent or the Missal of Pius V [1570]. In fact, all that was done at Trent, liturgically speaking, was to standardize the worship of the West[33]

Connely here is obviously attempting to disparage the knowledge of Western rite critics in an attempt to lessen the impact of opposing viewpoints, so it is perhaps appropriate that the same sort of detail-oriented critique be applied to his argument, starting with the above assertion that the Council of Trent standardized worship in the West. The last sentence is quite clearly mistaken since the council did not undertake a single liturgical reform, preferring to leave the actual reform of the missal and breviary to the papacy, who in turn delegated the reform project to a scholarly committee in the Curia, with the express purpose of restoring the rites to the 'pristine norm of the Fathers' (*ad pristinam Patrum normam*).[34] Even though Connely quickly goes on to attribute the suppression of rites other than those which could not demonstrate an existence of more than 200 years to both Pius V and the council, he has nevertheless proven himself careless from the very outset even while using accusations of such carelessness to deflect criticism from the rites presently in use by the AWRV.

More substantive is the actual claim on the work of the Council as being a simple act of standardizing the rubrics for celebrating the Mass. In a sense, Connely is correct that the Ordinary of Mass as celebrated at Rome suffered very little in the way of significant alteration as a result of the reform of the liturgy under Pius V, which is to say that very little was removed from the Ordinary. But such a gloss should not be interpreted to mean that what did change was insignificant, even if the existing Ordinary was largely left alone. Among the changes made to the rite include:

- Preparatory prayers moved from the sacristy to the foot of the altar and standardizing their content.[35]
- Suppression of several feasts, including the Presentation of Mary, St Anne, and St Anthony of Pedula. In addition, the calendar reform suppressed the cults of most

[33] Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*' 4.
[34] From the First. *Quo primum*. Pope Pius V. 14 July 1570.
[35] It is important to note that while many rites did in fact have psalmody as the procession entered the Church, the choice of psalm greatly varied from place to place and many uses, such as that of the Society of Jesus, omited the psalm altogether even as late as 1558. Cf. Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* I, 290-293.

non-Roman saints, with eighty-five percent belonging to Rome and predominately to the first four centuries, even at the expense of eliminating representation for nearly everyone else; for example, Germany's sole contribution to the universal calendar was St Ursula.[36]

- Removal of roodscreens and shortening of chancels to provide a unified space for the celebration of Mass and acoustics favourable to the homily rather than chanting; James White has likened the differences between churches built before Trent to 'a shrine to house the altar' and those after as a theatre to view the mass.[37]
- Requirement that the tabernacle be placed on the high altar rather than in an aumbry or freestanding sacrament houses.
- Construction of communion rails at the place for receiving the eucharist.
- Prescribing rubrics since most missals before this time lacked any note on ceremonial.[38]
- Elimination of all but four sequences and many other local embolisms, including the Marian additions to the *Gloria*.[39]
- Fixing the Last Gospel as a part of the ordinary.[40] This also included a more general reform of the lectionary to bring it into greater accord with the lectionary for the Daily Office, which had been issued two years before in 1568.

The most significant change of all was the standardization of Mass texts, and in particular the centralization of liturgical regulation, even down to the rubrication of the rite. So we can see that Connely's claim that only the Western liturgical tradition was standardized, while true when taken solely at face value, hides a rather extensive reform program that itself was 'far more unprecedented and untraditional than those which followed Vatican II'.[41]

Just as the complaint that *NOM* is a departure from the Western liturgical tradition is not unique to Western Rite Orthodoxy, so is the complaint that the rite gives to modernism, sacrificing Christian truth for the sake of 'relevancy'. The main villain,

---

[36] Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* I, 138 n.51.

[37] Cf. White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, 2-5. See also Nigel Yates, *Liturgical Space: Christian Worship and Church Buildings in Western Europe 1500-2000* (Burlington; Ashgate, 2008) for a fuller description of how churches under both Protestants and Catholics fared. Ironically enough, Protestant churches, especially Lutheran ones, retained their churches buildings largely intact even as late as the eighteenth century (7-24).

[38] Yates, *Liturgical Space*, 95.

[39] Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* I, 138-9.

[40] Though the Last Gospel was widespread, it was not universal. The Dominican rite omitted the Gospel until forced to adopt it in the 1600's. However, even here there was protest against the innovation as altar servers were instructed to extinguish the candles during the recitation of the Gospel even as late as the 1933 Typical Edition of the Dominican Missal. The Last Gospel was quickly dropped in 1965 Typical Edition as a result of *Sacrosanctum Concillium*. For more information on the Domincan rite, see William Bonniwell, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy* (New York: J. F. Wagner, 1944).

[41] Nathan Mitchell, 'The Amen Corner: Rereading Reform,' *Worship* 80.5 (2006) 465.

where one is pointed out, is often Archbishop Annibale Bugnini who chaired the *Concillium*, the commission which was tasked to reform the liturgy according to Vatican II. Bugnini himself has been at the centre of a number of conspiracy theories, some of which border on outright slander.[42] More problematic for Connely are the assumptions Bugnini supposedly had in developing the liturgy, particularly his reported belief that 'the norm for the liturgy and for Church renewal is modern Western man, because he is the perfect man, and the final man, and the everlasting man, because he is the perfect and normative man.'[43] Despite the problems with the characterization of Bugnini that are to be found in Connely's source,[44] he uses the quote to demonstrate the essential discontinuity of *NOM* from the Western liturgical tradition as a guilt by association.

What is truly ironic regarding the primary principle underlying the reform of Trent and Vatican II is that both were concerned with stripping away medieval accretions which obscured the patristic and noble genius of the rites, the very same 'modernist' principles that have so antagonized the Western Rite Orthodox as well as Traditionalist Catholics. The difference between the two approaches to the rite is that Pius V's commission to reform the missal lacked the essential textual tools and sources to adequately undertake the proposed program of reform, whereas by the time of Vatican II those same tools and textual resources both existed and had been the subject of constant study for the better part of a century. Another essential advantage of *Sacrosanctum Concillium* was that it possessed a number of qualified individuals on the permanent committee and access to experts within the field of liturgical studies. In truth, Vatican II represents the culmination of the work begun at Trent and *NOM* is closer to the ideal

[42] In particular, I am thinking of the accusation that Bugnini was a Freemason and that his supposed affiliation affected the reform of the liturgy, and that, when this affiliation was discovered by Paul IV, that Bugnini was removed from his position as prefect for the Congregation for Divine Worship and appointment as papal nuncio to Iran to prevent any embarrassment, to the Church. A decidedly different story is revealed in Piero Marini's *A Challenging Reform* where he describes Bugnini's as a victim of Curial politics, primarily because he did not take sufficient account of opinions about the reform of the liturgy that were held by powerful members of the Curia, especially those in the Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments. His conclusions are also supported by the fact that even before Bugnini was sent to Iran, the above mentioned congregations were fused into a single entity, with Divine Worship's staff reduced by half and relegated to a minor section of the Congregation for the Sacrament's offices (148-50).

[43] Connely, '*Lux Occidentalis*', 6, quoting Boniface Luykx in an interview with Robert Moynihan recorded as 'The Bitter Struggle', *Inside the Vatican*, (May, 1996) 19.

[44] The interview itself could be rejected on the premise that it is little more than hearsay. However, it should be noted that the Moynihan article generally presents a more nuanced view of Bugnini specifically and Vatican II generally. The principle of the interview, Archimandrite Boniface is himself supportive of Vatican II in the article and presents no particular complaint against *NOM*

form that the Tridentine reformers sought.[45] In some sense, Metropolitan Anthony is correct that the Tridentine rite is a product of 'counter-reformation debates,' even if it is expressed rather inadequately: both Protestants and Catholics, in developing or reforming their respective rites, sought to maintain fidelity to the patristic or apostolic liturgical witness as they understood it to have been. However, Connely is correct, in a limited sense, that the Tridentine rite is in continuity with the pre-existing Roman rite, though not to the extent that there was no substantive difference between how the liturgy was celebrated in the fifteenth century and how it was celebrated in the seventeenth: the intervening century has a significant impact. Rather, he is correct in that he presumes a process of organic continuity between the pre-existing rite and the Tridentine rite.

Alcuin Reid, following a path many Western Rite Orthodox might find acceptable, defines the problem of liturgical reform as one of organic continuity, and a continuity which is objectively identifiable.[46] We may understand Reid's designation of 'organic' as short hand for a particular view of liturgical development which emphasizes the process of reform as something that happens gradually and is directed from the bottom up by the faithful as they celebrate the rite, and not from the top down by liturgical specialists. This view is at least implicitly shared by many within Western Rite Orthodoxy.[47] But such a view, while noble, does not adequately capture the reality of the historic development of the liturgy. Even in the early period, liturgy was imposed from the top down by 'specialists', though the 'specialists' were the local clergy and the distance from the top to the bottom was considerably shorter. Nevertheless, we owe much of our liturgical uniformity today to the imposition of rites on the people from the top down. One of the reasons the 'Celtic rite' or the 'Gallican rite' or the 'Sarum rite' needs to be resuscitated is because they were pushed aside in favour of a rite that was developed and used somewhere else; the local rites were set aside not by the will of the whole faithful, but the by the choice of the few, or even the one, the bishop, who was responsible liturgical regulation within his diocese. Connelly, who is passionately devoted to the 1928 American *BCP*, would do well to remember that the 1549 *BCP* itself

[45] Mitchell, 'Introduction' in White, *Roman Catholic Worship*, x.
[46] Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*, 12-14, 285-287.
[47] Again, see Anderson, 'Three Masses Compared', 16 July 2006; 'One Small Step for the Novus Ordo: "Pro Multis"' 20 November 2006; and 'Restoring the Latin Mass: A Boon for "Ecumenism"?', 6 February 2007. <<http://www.westernorthodox.blogspot.com>>

was forced on an unwitting and unwilling populace 'with an inexcusable suddenness, between a Saturday night and a Monday morning at Pentecost 1549, the English liturgical tradition of nearly a thousand years was altogether overturned.'[48] Of course, that is to say nothing of the importation and imposition of the Roman rite to the displacement of the Celtic and Gallican liturgical traditions. The claim that liturgy develops organically among the faithful at all times simply cannot stand up to scrutiny. What does happen organically is that individual parishes or regions take the rite they have been provided and adapt it to their own use, either through omitting one text or adding another or providing gestures for the rite at various times and places. *The Anglican Missal*, from which TIK is ostensibly drawn, is a perfect example of this process at work: taking the basic 1928 American *BCP* and adding material to make it more 'catholic' and thus to satisfy the desires of Anglo-Catholics for a liturgy with increased ceremonial.

The third critique is not so much overtly stated in Western Rite Orthodox literature, but it is present as an underlying theme, specifically that *NOM* is grossly impious, culturally and ascetically deficient when compared to the Tridentine rite and, what is more, is downright ugly. Mangle's account of his conversion to Orthodoxy brings the point out most forcefully, as he describes the newer liturgy and the elements that he experienced surrounding it in variously negative ways.[49] This has led Mangels to the conclusion that the new liturgy is uniformly celebrated in a way that is unpleasing, both to men and to God, whereas the Tridentine rite was uniformly a pious and holy affair, celebrated with reverence and fear. We have already answered the first point in referring to Mangle's criticism of the new rites, but it is also important to address the underlying assumption that the Tridentine rite was consistently celebrated in a pious manner.

Mangels offers his own anecdotal account of what quite clearly seems to have been a very reverently celebrated Tridentine mass, and such an anecdotal account is at least appropriate since most of our information from this period, especially in North America, is largely anecdotal. But for every anecdotal account like Mangels, there are

[48] Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, 686. Stories, perhaps apocryphal, of laity holding the priest to the altar with a pitchfork at his throat and demanding he say the liturgy the 'old way' are a common feature of Pentecost homilies in Episcopal and Anglican parishes during annual commemorations of the first prayerbook.
[49] Mangels, 'Orthodox Odyssey', *Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 21-2.

other accounts which describe a liturgy which had largely ceased to be the work of the people and was rarely understood by them, as Bernard Botte opines in his memoir:

> Every morning at eight o'clock there was a Mass in the student's chapel….Up front there was only one altar in a little apse located between two sacristies. Mass was said by an old, more or less voiceless priest – even in the first row the only thing you'd hear was a murmur. The group rose for the gospel, but nobody dreamed of telling us what gospel it was….Receiving communion at this Mass was out of the question. For that matter, no one at the time seemed to notice a relationship between the Mass and communion….When one of my sisters asked the advice of the dean of the upper end of Charleroi, Monsignor Lalieu (a doctor of theology and an author of a book on the Mass), about the best time to receive communion, he recommended she receive before Mass and then offer Mass in thanksgiving for communion. This sounds strange to us, but we ought to keep in mind the ideas then current. Mass was no longer the prayer of the Christian community.[50]

Nor was this sort of situation limited to the laity since,

> Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York was an example of the lengths to which the alienation of the bishop from the liturgy could go. Pleading the weight of his other obligations, Cardinal Spellman obtained dispensations from Pius XII, so that the Cardinal never recited the Divine Office and almost never celebrated the Eucharist. He used to attend Mass on Sundays and holy days; on Christmas he would visit an American military base…and offer a Low Mass for the servicemen. Cardinal Spellman was an extreme case, but he was not unique.[51]

Those are normative examples of how the Tridentine rite was celebrated. Moreover, Mangle's experience of Solemn High Mass as being something regular, and even something to look forward to, apparently does not match the experience of most Catholics in North America. Thomas Day provides numerous examples of Catholics who, in the pre-Vatican II era, not only did not attend Solemn High Mass but also frequently went out of their way to avoid it.[52] Cardinal Heenan is equally forceful when he concludes that 'our people love the Mass, but it is Low Mass without psalm-singing and

---

[50] Botte, *From Silence to Participation*, 2-3.

[51] Serge Keleher, 'What Happened to the Liturgical Movement: A View from the East' in Stratford Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 76.

[52] Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the author's personal recollection that on one Sunday the priest announced the mass which would start in a few minutes would be high mass and the next low mass would come later, after which the majority of those assembled rose from their place and left (Day, *Why Catholics Can't Sing*, 42)

other musical embellishments to which they are chiefly attached.'[53] Such liturgies, with a congregation which understands little and desires understanding less may well be very reverent and pious on occasion, but they certainly fall far short of the ideal for the Tridentine liturgy that Mangels has established.

Moreover, his insinuation that the Tridientine rite, as opposed to *NOM*, was free from abuse is far from certain. One prominent abuse associated with the altar was frequently they were frequently little more hollow wooden boxes, often transformed into ecclesiastical cupboards rather than being constructed of stone as the rubrics stated. One might also mention the holy pandemonium in large cathedrals as mass was celebrated at the high altar while any other number of services and devotions forged ahead simultaneously in the side chapels, often visibly or audibly while priests not occupied with some other task valiantly attempted to minister to penitents.[54] Mangels and Connely both point at the abuses of *NOM*, and to be certain they are several,[55] to delegitimize the newer liturgies, but it is also important to remember that the Tridentine rite was not free of abuse, neglect, or what would otherwise be considered 'impiety'. The obvious disconnect is that when the Tridentine rite is either celebrated, among Traditionalist Catholics, duly authorized Roman Catholic priests, or in the Western Rite Orthodox form, it is celebrated by a highly motivated core who wish to demonstrate their love of and fidelity to the rite. By contrast, celebration of *NOM* is a given of life for the vast majority of Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Lutheran parishes. The same people who now abuse the present rites were the ones who were abusing the older rites, or at least were trained by those who abused the older rite. And were the older rites still in prominent use, they would be abusing them, too. Those who loved the Tridentine rite abandoned their former communions to celebrate the older liturgy and were able to appeal to an idealized past using a very selective example of the present. The emotive appeal to an romanticized 'golden age' of liturgy that Mangels and others make never existed, and

---

[53] Scott Reid, *A Bitter Trial: Evelyn Waugh and John Carmel Cardinal Heenan on the Liturgical Changes* (Curdridge: Saint Austin Press, 1996), 68-9.
[54] Keleher, 'What Happened to the Liturgical Movement?' in Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic*, 77-8.
[55] Aside from masses for various sub-groups which are mentioned by Mangels (some of which, such as Masses where children are the majority of the faithful, are officially sanctioned), one might point at so-called 'folk masses', 'clown masses', liturgical dance, reciting the presidential prayers in common, composing unique anaphora, and 'mob concelebrations', among others. For a more thorough listing of practices which are currently considered to be abusive, see *Redemptionis Sacramentum*, §48-§79.

indeed is as equally fallacious as appeals to a golden age of liturgy in the apostolic era, or the Byzantine era, or the medieval era, or any era, for that matter: golden ages either do not exist, or are significantly more tarnished than we anticipated upon closer inspection.

What is especially problematic for Western Rite Orthodoxy's hostility to liturgical change is that the Western rite liturgies have been changed to resemble the same alterations that were made as a result of Vatican II. The most dramatic changes within the *SASB* include the severely truncated rite for the sick, the mishmash of the various elements of the nuptial blessing, and the near total elimination of the collecter from the Tikhonite offices. While there is a substantive argument for why some changes were necessary, some Western Rite Orthodox reforms have resulted in ritual impoverishment and frequently demonstrate a lack of subtle understanding of the deep structure of the liturgy, the theology expressed in the liturgy of the Byzantine rite, and even the theology expressed or implied by their own Western rite.

In correcting assumptions about the pre-Vatican II 'golden age of piety' are relatively easy to counter because they involve a historic amnesia that is effortlessly rectified as there are more than enough accounts of priests celebrating the Tridentine rite in a haphazard way over the last century. These accounts also include anecdotes of the laxity of the laity in the celebration of the rite to the point that they busied themselves with a rosary or some other pious activity rather than what we might identify as 'the liturgy'.[56] The truth behind the assumption is that habitual abuses in celebration of the Tridentine rite were not corrected as a part of the transition to *NOM*, although the specific abuses and improprieties are not identical. Furthermore, there are still numerous clergy and laity who celebrate *NOM* with piety and reverence, just as there were priests and laity who celebrated the Tridentine rite in the same manner. The second complaint is less easily untangled, but the important question is to throw the critique back on to itself.

Western Rite Orthodox insist that they are simply being faithful to the liturgical tradition of the Western Church. However,

> so much depends here on how one construes the liturgical tradition. If one compares the missal of 1962 with the Missal of 1969 or the pre- and post-Vatican II ordination rites, for example, one may conclude that the reform was a radical departure from the organic development of the tradition.

[56] Irwin, *Text and Context*, 61.

> Balancing this is a view of the tradition as a whole, including an appreciation of the liturgies of the Christian East….If by 'the Catholic tradition' one insists on understanding the condition of Catholicism immediately prior to Vatican II, then the reform can look like a betrayal. If one looks at the tradition as a whole, on the other hand, then far from being a betrayal, it is an enrichment.[57]

Thus, Western Rite Orthodox are faithful to the early modern inheritance of the Church whereas the *NOM* attempts to draw on the older traditions from the era of the Great Councils. The question cannot be phrased simply as 'who is being faithful to the Western liturgical traditions' when the important question is 'which portion of the liturgical tradition are we to be most faithful toward?' As we have already seen, Trent viewed its responsibility towards the balance of Church tradition, though with more emphasis provided to the first millennium of Christianity. While Connely and others have objected that the changes to the liturgy after Trent were comparatively minor, this is merely rhetorical sleight of hand since even minor changes can have a significant impact. By way of example, of 161 words in the Latin version of the Nicene Creed, only one is *filioque*.

Although the judgment of Western Rite Orthodox of *NOM* has been uniformly unfavourable, the assessment from their Eastern rite counterparts is more mixed, and often times positive. Schememann notes that 'many of the reforms of the liturgy are more in line with Orthodox thinking than the pre-existing liturgy.'[58] This creates something of a difficulty for the Orthodox, acknowledging on the one hand that *NOM* is in many ways a more Orthodox liturgy than the Tridentine rite, yet permitting and encouraging the celebration of that Tridentine mass. This only serves to push the question of *NOM*'s place within Western Orthodoxy further since it is acknowledged to be both more authentically Roman and more authentically Orthodox than anything currently in use by the Western rite. One can hardly fault Alexander Turner's group who became Orthodox yet retained what is now GRE since they became Orthodox before the reforms of Vatican II, and Turner had already died by the time the liturgical reforms were fully realized. But the same measure cannot be extended to those communities who joined Orthodoxy following Vatican II precisely because they wanted to retain their liturgies in their present form. It

[57] Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 137.
[58] Schmemann, 'Some Reflections Upon "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 268.

is without a doubt that Overbeck would have been horrified by the changes to the rite since Vatican II; however, it is equally doubtless that Overbeck would have been even more horrified by the adaptation of the Anglican Missal to Orthodox Christianity, particularly given his hostility towards Anglo-Catholics within the Anglican Communion.

None of the preceding is to suggest that *NOM* is a perfect liturgy or that it has been implemented perfectly: it is not and it has not. The essential point that the new rites are not the extreme break with the past as suggested by the Western Rite Orthodox, even if the way it has been implemented is often quite irregular and at variance with the specified norms of celebration. In other words, focusing on how the rite is abused should have nothing to do with how the rite was envisioned, especially when this predisposition towards liturgical abuses has been carried over into *NOM* without so much as a thought. Secondly, despite Connely's mythology to the contrary, GRE and TIK have both undergone revision and alteration over the centuries, even since the Tridentine period. The Missal of Pius V, promulgated after Trent, represented a departure from the path that the liturgy had been on prior to that point, just as *NOM* represents a departure from Trent. Why one departure should be acceptable and not the other remains to be conclusively demonstrated by both Western Orthodox and Traditionalist Catholics alike, since both groups allege the illicit nature of *NOM* as an authentic expression of the Roman rite. In the third place, Western Rite Orthodoxy does in fact adopt some of the changes to the liturgy, though here again why some changes are acceptable and others are not is never rationalised.

Rather, all of this is to suggest that the rationale for the violent rejection of *NOM* is really unsustainable, especially since the Orthodox Western Rite retains elements which are problematic for Orthodox spirituality and ecclesiology, in the marriage and chrismation rites, or adds elements which betray the historic structure of the Roman rite, elements such as the 'stronger' epiclesis. In espousing a mythology which states that the Roman rite has not changed since before the Great Schism in any substantial way, Western Rite Orthodox actually expose themselves to greater criticism for having changed their rites to adapt to the desire of Orthodox hierarchs. It begs the question: why, if GRE is substantively unchanged since 1054, is there a need to make substantive change now? Again, no real answer has been provided, in part because the necessary questions

are not being asked. But, as we have already seen, the Western rite has undergone a process of development even after the time of the Great Schism, even since the immediate post-Tridentine era. And, while it is true that during the Tridentine reform the parts of the ordinary, like the canon, remained untouched, it is important to remember that the liturgy is more than just the ordinary, but includes how we celebrate the liturgy and in this regard, the Tridentine reform was extreme and thorough.[59] This really cuts to the heart of both liturgical arguments that Western Rite Orthodoxy makes for itself: first, the rites are essentially Orthodox because they are essentially unchanged (they are not) and secondly, having the Tridentine version of the rites is necessary because the new rite is an extreme departure from the liturgical tradition of the West (it is not). And it is perhaps this argument that most seriously challenges the existence of the Western rite, particularly the AWRV, in its present form.[60]

The Ecumenical Problem

In the previous chapter, we saw that some critics dismiss Western Rite Orthodoxy with the epitaph 'uniatism'. The specific reasons for why this dismissal is problematic have already been discussed, but there is one similarity between the Eastern Catholic Churches and the Western Rite Orthodox in the potential barrier that both the Western Rite Orthodox and Eastern Catholics present towards rapprochement between East and West.[61] The Orthodox/Roman Catholic Joint International Commission in 1993 simultaneously declared that uniatism could not be a path towards future union,[62] defining uniatism as an attempt to re-establish unity between East and West by establishing union with a limited part of the opposite church.[63] Certainly this purpose has

[59] Lest Western Rite Orthodox protest that how the liturgy is celebrated is unimportant, one fails to understand why there is a simultaneous insistence on celebrating *ad orientum* rather than *versus populum*.
[60] On this point, it is perhaps well to remember Alexander Turner's perspective on presumptions liturgical modification by an individual priest acting on his own initiative: 'Meanwhile, individual preferences, whims, and pet theories must be subordinated to the common good and common practice whatever the sacrifice of individual will. It is not uncommon that men but vaguely informed about the history, purpose and theology of the Western Rite approach it with presuppositions which lead them to expect an outlet for their personal theories of rite or teaching' (*Western Rite Directory*, n.p.).
[61] Mott, 'Some Perspectives on the Western Rite I', *SVTQ* 26.2 (1982) 124-5.
[62] Joint International Commission, '*Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past*', §2 in Borelli and Erickson (eds.), *The Quest for Unity*, 175.
[63] Ibid., §7-§9.

been part of the for Western Rite Orthodoxy's existence,[64] and at least on that point meets the definition of uniatism. In that regard, Western Rite Orthodoxy, like the Eastern Catholic Churches, presents a unique obstacle to any ecumenical dialogue between Orthodoxy and the West which has eventual intercommunion as a stated or implied goal for the same efforts.

Superficially, Western Rite Orthodoxy does not seem to be the same sort of ecumenical problem that the Eastern Catholic Churches have proven to be because the historic circumstances that lead to the creation of an Orthodox Western Rite are decidedly different from those which brought about Western Rite Orthodoxy, as a movement, was begun at the initiative of those in the West seeking to join Orthodoxy rather than the Orthodox actively seeking proselytes.[65] Additionally, Western Rite Orthodoxy is clearly minuscule, even when compared to just one of the Eastern Catholic Churches. For these reasons, the Western rite is of little immediate concern because it is unlikely to make any effect on the progress of dialogue so that at present, and thus is only 'a neutral factor at worst'.[66] However, simply because the issue is small and therefore a relatively unobtrusive factor does not mean that it will remain so in the future.

In a very real way, the Western Rite Orthodoxy represents acceptance by the Orthodox Church of groups that share affinity with larger movements which many mainstream Western churches view as being schismatic at the very least. Furthermore, Western Rite Orthodoxy offers a new charge against the West, not on points of recognized doctrinal disagreement (such as the *filioque* or papal infallibility), but on liturgy itself, that is, on internal ecclesiological discipline. It is as if the Orthodox Church were saying to the West that the West has no right whatsoever to regulate its own internal life without such changes making further deviations from the Apostolic norm, even if such changes may be warranted, and even if such changes may be acceptable to

---

[64] Cf. for example Annette Milkovich, 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: Its History, Its Validity, and Its Opportunity', *The Russian Orthodox Journal* (November 1990), 7-10, 25; Schneirla, 'Editorial: The Twain Meet', *The Word* 37.5 (1993) 3; Young, 'An Introduction', in Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 9; and Trigg, 'Our Plea' in Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 27-31.

[65] Overbeck came to Orthodoxy of his own motivation rather than as a result of any specific proselytization by any Orthodox person in Germany or Britain. Similarly, Turner's group returned to the Antiochian Archdiocese of their own initiative and primarily because they traced their ecclesial lineage back to St Raphael of Brooklyn via William Nichols and Aftimios Ofilesh.

[66] Mott, 'Some Perspectives on the Western Rite – I', *SVTQ* 26.2 (1982) 125.

Orthodoxy in abstract, as was proposed by Schmemann.[67] This creates something of a difficulty for the Orthodox, acknowledging on the one hand that *NOM* is in many ways a more Orthodox liturgy than the Tridentine rite, yet permitting and encouraging the celebration of that Tridentine rite without any of Vatican II's modifications to the liturgy. This only serves to push the question of *NOM*'s place within Western Orthodoxy further since it is acknowledged to be both more authentically Roman and more authentically Orthodox than anything currently in use by Western Rite Orthodox. By contrast, Orthodoxy has chosen liturgical separatists who view the Tridentine rite as the only legitimate form of the Roman rite as the legitimate liturgical expression of a future Orthodox West, while simultaneously carrying on dialogue with a West that has consciously chosen a different liturgical life. This dialogue does not include indication that should reunion be accomplished, anything in the liturgy that reversion to previous liturgical forms will be necessary, though it is implied by Orthodoxy's acceptance of the Western rite. Though the parallel is inexact, the situation is similar to the Roman Catholic Church, while engaged in official dialogue with the Ecumenical Patriarchate simultaneously acknowledged the various Old Calendarist groups as being the legitimate expression of Orthodoxy.

Simultaneously, Western Rite Orthodoxy has no particularly positive purpose within the ecumenical dialogue, though it is sometimes claimed that the Western rite can be used to interpret Orthodoxy to Westerners. However, it is unclear what interpretive value Western Rite Orthodoxy might possess: they have neither fully absorbed an Orthodox ethos themselves nor do they have a connection with the current liturgical or ecclesial life of the Western Churches, as both of these items have been definitively rejected. In many ways, Western Rite Orthodoxy has become what it should not be: a showpiece to demonstrate diversity, which may contribute to the feeling among Western Orthodox of being in an ecclesiastical ghetto.

Even though Western Rite Orthodoxy is not an obvious ecumenical problem at the moment, it ultimately may be a problem because it remains to be seen if Orthodoxy will be able to overcome the challenge that the Western rite presents of its own initiative or if it will leave them to be settled at a later date, perhaps when reunion is closer to hand.

---

[67] Schmemann, 'Some Reflections Upon "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 268.

Surely whatever solution is reached for Eastern Catholic Churches could theoretically be implemented with regards to the Western Rite Orthodox. However, this assumption betrays an ignorance of the progress Eastern Catholics have made in the past century in towards greater uniformity with their Orthodox counterparts.[68] No such similar process can be observed within Western Rite Orthodoxy. This should come as no surprise since the position of Western Rite as to Orthodoxy is itself unstable. Perhaps the real question is what an eventual reunion between Orthodox and Catholic would look like. Apologists for the Western rite are often happy to pose that in the event of an actual reunion, the Western church would continue to use the Western rite. While one might suspect that a few Eastern Orthodox prelates or theologians might insist on the Roman Church adopting the Byzantine rite, the vast majority would perhaps assume that the Western Churches would simply continue to use a Western rite. In that instance, the question of the Western rite apologist becomes more interesting since the Western Churches would probably not use the current Orthodox Western rite; rather, they would continue to use *NOM* or whatever rite was then current. This would result in current Western Rite Orthodox being unwittingly forced to acknowledge the Orthodoxy of (perhaps) or even adopt (more likely) the very same rites that are presently the object of their hostility.

Perhaps Western rite apologists comfort themselves with the belief, however unreasonable, that before coming to the point where Eastern and Western Churches reunite, the Western churches would realize what a mistake *NOM* has been and revert to the older rites. The Western Church, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, has begun to conclude that there were problems with the way liturgical change was carried out, especially in the areas of translation. What they have not acknowledged is that the liturgy in itself is a wholesale abandonment of the entirety of the Western Christian tradition as Western Rite Orthodoxy has maintained, and it is unlikely that they will do so.[69] This

[68] Although this progress remains mixed, many churches have reintegrated an authentic Byzantine spirituality, though liturgical changes have often met stiff resistance. Melkites seem to have gone the furthest in rolling back latinisations, though it is still possible to see the Solemn Benediction in Melkite parishes. At the opposite end is the Ukranian Greek Catholic Church which insists on retaining Latinisations and has an equivalent to the Society of St Pius X in the Priestly Society of St Josaphat Kuntsevych, which is opposes de-latinisation specifically and the developments in the post-Vatican II Catholic Church generally.

[69] Even Pope Benedict XVI, who mistakenly regards Pope Paul VI to have not intended the Tridentine rite to be entirely suppressed by *NOM*, still speaks explicitly of *NOM* as the ordinary form of the Latin rite, while the Tridentine rite is an extraordinary form. Furthermore, while Tridentine masses have increased

leaves us with the highly unlikely scenario that western churches would be expected to abandon their current liturgical practices in favour of using GRE and TIK or, as may likely happen, Western Rite Orthodox would be expected to abandon their liturgical uses for *NOM*. Such a scenario can only lead to disappointment by Western Rite Orthodox, or perhaps even an acute sense of betrayal and could potentially lead to schism by the Western rite. All this is given greater probability when one considers that many Western Rite Orthodox became Orthodox precisely as a rejection of present liturgical practice.

Equally problematic for ecumenical relationships is that, in accepting the Western rite, the Eastern Orthodox Church has essentially taken a unilateral stand on liturgical/theological issues that are still to be discussed in bilateral dialogues. Here again the problem of the epiclesis predominates the list of potential future problems. By demanding that the Western Rite Orthodox insert a consecratory Spirit epiclesis into the liturgy, the Orthodox Church is implicitly stating that any future union between an Eastern and Western Church, this type of epiclesis will be a necessary liturgical concession. On the other hand, where the epiclesis has been mentioned in official joint statements, the language used seemingly affirms that an explicit Spirit epiclesis is not necessary since the entire liturgy can be viewed as epicletic.[70] While it is true that the epiclesis was inserted into the Western rite long before the present bilateral dialogues and their statements were begun and that the reformed Western liturgies include Eucharistic Prayers with a Spirit epiclesis, the present Western Rite Orthodox liturgies stand as direct statements of praxis and are therefore powerful in their own way. Liturgical changes which have been imposed by the Orthodox Church may or may not be a significant issue as dialogue brings both sides closer to rapprochement, but the potential for significant ecumenical disruption does exist because of implicit stands taken and exemplified in the Western rite.

While the ecumenical problem is not an immediate one, it is no less significant for the ultimate future of the Western rite. Especially as regards rite, the problem is acute only as long as those who left their former communions remain alive and within the

---

since Benedict's liberisation of Tridentine celebrations, there are no reliable statistics on the number of persons forty and under who prefer the Tridentine mass over *NOM*.

[70] Cf. Joint International Commission, 'The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity' §I.5.c., John Borelli and John H. Erickson (eds.), *The Quest for Unity*, 55.

leadership of the AWRV. Therefore, we cannot predict what will become of the Western rite in a generation since the liturgical imperative for the Western rite's growth in the 1970's and 1980's may disappear, to be substituted with other imperatives. This will produce its own set of issues that will have to be overcome but cannot necessarily be accurately predicted. On the other hand, these same sentiments could become an acute sense of attachment to the rite as currently constructed, carrying an explicit understanding that the liturgy as presently constituted is the authentic, and perhaps the only authentic, expression Western Orthodoxy and creating an even greater ecumenical problem in the process. If Western Rite Orthodoxy evolves further into this sort of liturgical fundamentalism, it could be devastating for ecumenical rapprochement between East and West. These problems should be addressed now in some way rather than allowing them to fester beneath the surface until they are nearly impossible to satisfactorily resolve.

The Canonical Problem

One of the more serious, though less frequently mentioned, problems presented by Western Rite Orthodoxy is that the Western rite itself is ultimately a canonical problem. By this, I do not mean one of canonical jurisdiction, but rather the standing of the Western rite in terms of Orthodox canon law. For the most part, these canonical questions have not been considered, or have only been considered in a passing sort of way. So much attention has been directed towards the text of the liturgy, the present study included, that very little space is provided to addressing the canonical challenge that Western Rite Orthodoxy presents to the rest of the Orthodox Church. This canonical problem arises because the entire enterprise has been entered into without a thorough understanding of the concept of rite as more than just a liturgy, neglecting that a rite 'must be seen as a Church's theological-liturgical-cultural reality...*not* some theological-liturgical-cultural "suit of clothes" worn by the one Church in order to create an impression variety and diversity.'[71] A rite is therefore the totality of the life of that Church within a given theological-liturgical-cultural framework. A rite is more than a Eucharistic liturgy: it is also the disciplines surrounding that liturgy, the forms of celebration of the other sacraments, devotional practices, monastic activity, and the

[71] Manel Nin, 'History of the Eastern Liturgies' in Chupungco (ed.), *HLS* I, 115, emphasis original.

theological reflection that grows from the worshiping community, to name a few points. In summation, a rite is the totality of the local Church being the Church.

The Western rite does meet some of the criteria for 'rite' in the definition provided above, but the only place where the Western Rite seems fully formed is in the area of liturgy, and even then, there are disputes about what constitutes the authoritative text for celebrating the eucharist. The formation of other aspects of the rite has been very uneven, particularly within the AWRV. For example, while medievalisms are permitted into the celebration of the rite, especially in the area of devotional practices, monastic orders are theoretically only allowed to exist according to the Rule of St Benedict since it antedates the Great Schism.[72] While Metropolitan Anthony's *Edict on the Western Rite* directly states that 'Western rite parishes and clergy are subject to the canons of the Orthodox Church'[73] and while this seems acceptable initially, there are serious problems that arise from this clause. Because the canon law of the Orthodox Church envisions only one rite, the Byzantine rite, making strict adherence to this portion of the edict impossible without modification to the Western rite in ways that are not normally envisioned, thus making it conform less to the substantive definition of rite. Such dire pronouncements may not be obvious from the outset, but with a further explanation, the intended meaning becomes clearer.

If one is not careful, one of Schmemann's more subtle critiques of the Western Rite might go unnoticed. In a response to Sopko, who laments what he sees as evidence of creeping Byzantinisation, Schmemann comments that '[Sopko] deplores, not without some irony, the abandonment by St Stephen's parish of the daily celebration of the eucharist during Great Lent, celebration forbidden as everyone knows, not only in the Eastern Rite, but by an Ecumenical Council as well.'[74] Here, Schmemann is referring to the Penthekte Council, better known in the West as the Quinisext Council or the Synod in Trullo. This council was convoked by Justinian II in 691/692 ostensibly to complete the work of Constantinople II (553) and III (681) since these councils did not have any

[72] Here, I state theoretically because there is no active monastic movement within the AWRV, just as the Antiochian Archdiocese possess only one monastery under its jurisdiction; it is an Eastern rite monastery and is very small. Additionally, unless one is reading Benedictine sources, the Rule of St Benidict, however influential subsequently, was far from the only or even most important Rule in the medieval period.
[73] Metropolitan Anthony (Bashir), 'Edict on the Western Rite', §7, reprinted in *The Word* 2.8 (1958).
[74] Schmemann, 'Some Reflections on "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 267.

associated disciplinary canons. The council was composed of 215 bishops, many of whom had been present at the previous council in 681, but there were no Western bishops invited. Basil of Gortyne claimed to represent the Papacy as he had during Constantinople III, but it is far from certain whether or not he was so authorized or merely acting on the authority he possessed a decade earlier.[75]

The council approved 102 canons, several of which have commonly been regarded as contrary to the discipline of the Church of Rome, including:

- Acknowledging the validity of all eighty-five of the so-called Apostolic Canons (§2).
- Allowing married men to be ordained deacons and priests (§6, §13, §30) while allowing those who had contracted second marriages and been ordained to remain among the clergy rather than be deposed (§3).
- Reiterating Canon 28 of Chalcedon (§36).[76]
- Forbidding the full Mass on Weekdays in Lent (§52).[77]
- Forbidding fasting on Saturdays (§55) and as a consequence changing the start of Lent.[78]
- Abstaining from meat that had been strangled (§67).
- Forbidding the representation of Christ as a Lamb (§82).

Though the council fathers considered it to be ecumenical, as is evidenced by the very first canon, the West frequently treated the council with open hostility. Bede describes

---

[75] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 285, Nicolae Dură, 'The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo' in George Nedungatt and Michael Featherstone (eds.), *The Council in Trullo Revisited* (Rome: Pontifico Istituto Orientale, 1995), 254, and Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome*, 220, assume that Basil acted under papal authority since Crete was under the nominal jurisdiction of Rome at the time, with Ekonomou and Davis adding that the papal *apokrisiarii* would have participated in the council as well; whether the latter would have possessed any lawful authority is questionable since they were the normal papal delegation to Constantinople and were not specifically charged to represent the Pope at an ecumenical council.

[76] Ekonomou and Dură both insist that this canon could not have been objectionable since it was already contained in Canon §28 of Chalcedon (451) and Canon §3 of Constantinople I (381). Though the canon entered Western collections in the sixth century, the canon itself was not explicitly accepted as legitimate until the thirteenth century at Lyons II (1274); see Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 129-30, 190-4. Even if the legality of the canon were acceptable to Rome, the theory of primacy that underlies these three canons would have been wholly unacceptable. On the other hand, the fact that the council needed to re-promulgate Canon §28 of Chalcedon indicates that it still had not been accepted everywhere at this point in time, in contrast to the claims of Ekonomou and Dură.

[77] A practice also condemned in Canon §49 of the Council of Laodicea, 363/4.

[78] Western Lent begins on the Wednesday six Sundays before Easter. Since Saturdays (but not Sundays) are counted in the fast, that brings Lent to thirty-six days of Lent and the season is rounded out to a full forty days when the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of the preceding week are added. Were Saturdays not included, the start of Lent would by necessity be ten days earlier since the seven Saturdays that are counted in the fast would need to be replaced with weekdays, thus providing seven weeks of Lent as in the current Byzantine practice, following the canons of the Council in Trullo.

the council as a 'reprobate synod' and Paul the Deacon dismisses it with the epitaph of erratic. Pope Sergius resolutely rejected the council, stating that he would rather die than 'consent to erroneous novelties'.[79] While we do not know which canons Sergius was opposed to, Canon §82 aroused particular fury in the Syrian-born Pope as he added the chant *Agnus Dei* to the liturgy and ordered the that the mosaic *Worship of the Lamb* be restored in St Peter's Basilica.[80]

If Sergius proved to be a man of intractable loyalties to the Roman form of Christianity, Justinian was equally fiery in his temperament, as contemporary accounts suggest, and was not to have his imperial will thwarted easily. Like his, predecessor Constans II had done in dealing with Pope Martin, Justinian dispatched the *protospatharios* in Ravenna to arrest the Pope.[81] Unfortunately for Justinian, he would have less success than his grandfather as the citizenry of Ravenna and Rome defended Sergius, to the point that Justinian's envoy was left to cower under the Pope's bed while Sergius tried to disperse the mob.[82] Shortly afterwards, Justinian was exiled the matter was dead until his return to power in 705. At that time, Justinian was more amenable to compromise and requested the current Pope, John VI, inform him which canons were deemed offensive by the Roman Church. When that attempt failed due to the Pope's death, the same demand was made to his successor, John VII. The latter simply returned the canons of Trullo without comment.[83] The situation was finally resolved in 705 when Pope Constantine personally visited the emperor in Constantinople and agreed that the council would be accepted as ecumenical but the West would simply ignore the canons it deemed reprehensible.[84]

Aside from Rome, there was little support for accepting the council as ecumenical, much less the canons contrary to Western practice. The sole exception was Spain where the bishops made a formal acceptance of the council at the demand of King Wittiza. However, that council (Toledo XVIII, ca. 703) was omitted from later Spanish

[79] Raymond Davis (ed.), *Liber Pontificalis* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989), 84.
[80] Ibid., 85.
[81] Ibid., 85.
[82] Ibid., 85.
[83] Ibid., 89.
[84] Ibid., 91.

canonical collections and was definitively repudiated at a later council in Asturias.[85] Later, during the iconoclastic period, Pope Hadrian acknowledged the council as ecumenical and used Canon §82 to support his opposition to iconoclasm.[86] Finally, John VIII affirmed that the canons of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (including Trullo) were accepted by the Roman Church provided that they 'were not contrary to previous canons or decrees of the holy pontiffs of this see or to good morals.'[87] Subsequently, there has been little comment on the validity or ecumenicity of the Trullan canons, except to reject them outright. Certainly, there are reasons to consider the extent that the council was received as ecumenical in the West, but this question is beyond the scope of the present work.[88] What is significant for our concern is that even if the canons of Trullo were received as ecumenical (and that is not without significant discussion), they were at the very least selectively enforced where the matter came to legislation contrary to established Roman ecclesiastical tradition, if the canons were ever enforced at all. Certainly, the prohibitions of the council do not exert significant influence on Western liturgy, at least in the sense that absolutely no change to Western liturgical practice resulted from attempts to conform to the canons.

However, the importance of Trullo cannot be overstated for its importance to Orthodox canon law since the council represents a codification of the practices of in the Eastern Church at the time of its convocation. Such a codification was likely the purpose of the council from the start, as Justinian II likely sought to emulate his namesake who had promulgated a great code of civil law.[89] The council was primarily composed of eastern prelates (almost exclusively so) assuring that the legal tradition would primarily be that of the Christian East, even at the expense of the West. Despite claims to the contrary that canons which are normally regarded as anti-Western are not a rejection of the West, at least the canons on the marriage of clergy explicitly state that permission to marry before ordination is a deliberate choice against the 'severity' of Rome. More to the point, insofar as liturgical matters are concerned, the council charts a distinctly Eastern

[85] Roger Collins, *The Arab Conquest of Spain, 710-797* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd., 1989), 18-9.
[86] Dură, 'The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo' in Nedungatt and Featherstone (eds.), *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 244.
[87] Ibid., 245.
[88] Ibid., 245-9, where he argues that the council was accepted as ecumenical in the West.
[89] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 285.

course for the Church, one which speaks to the growing hegemony of the Constantinople's rite and disciplines; this course is subsequently followed by those churches within the imperial capital's sphere of influence, even after the empire itself had ceased to exist. As already suggested, the purpose in identifying a canonical question is not to suggest that the Western rite is uncanonical in and of itself, but rather that the Western rite represents an aberration from the form envisioned by Orthodox canon law.

While the nature of the reception of the council in the West can be disputed, what is not disputed is that in the East the council is received as ecumenical and the council intended itself to be ecumenical. Justinian II certainly desired that the council be ecumenical because he sent copies of its acts to be signed by the Bishops of Rome and Ravenna, among others. But even though the council designates itself as ecumenical, it does so because there was representation from the entirety of the area controlled by the empire, including Armenia, despite the fact that the Armenians were monophysite, as the discourse of Catholicos Sahak III in the acts of the council demonstrates,[90] and from Rome, nominally in the form of Basil of Gortyna. In that sense, the council is *ecumenical* because the whole *ecumene* is represented, that is, the whole of the empire. However, despite the insinuation to the contrary by a number of authors, such ecumenicity is entirely different from what is normally meant by the modern use of the designation 'Ecumenical Council'.

Saying that Western Rite Orthodoxy represents a canonical problem is not meant to suggest that the problem is the West's failure to follow every canon of Penthekte since Eastern rite churches themselves do not follow the canons in every detail. By way of example, Orthodox Christians who marry a Roman Catholic or a Lutheran are not excommunicated, despite the Trullan requirement to the contrary.[91] The real problem is that the Western rite has been included within the Orthodox Church without significant consideration to the place it should occupy in a canonical tradition which does not envision its existence. Nowhere is this more painfully obvious than in Schmemann's disagreement with Sopko. The Orthodox Church is only in the beginnings of approaching the relationship between Penthekte and the West. And even when the point is raised, it is

[90] Michael van Esbroeck, 'Le Discours du Catholicos Sahak III en 691 et Quelques Documents Arméniens Annexes au Quinisexte' in Nedungatt and Featherstone (eds.), *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 322-48.
[91] Frederick R. McManus, 'The Council in Trullo', *GOTR* 40.1-2 (1995) 86-7.

done in explicitly dogmatic form wherein the Eastern Churches do not '[pretend] to impose this discipline [regarding contrary Western customs] upon the practice of the Western Church, especially as they themselves do not practice everywhere the hundred and two canons mentioned. All they wished to do was maintain the ancient discipline against the abuses and evil innovations of the Roman Church.'[92] Such assertions, aside from being contrary to what we know of Western liturgical history, are ultimately unhelpful posturing based on false assumptions. While it is true that no Orthodox Church today observes all 102 canons, it is unlikely that when those canons were promulgated they were not intended to be followed or that the anti-Western canons were merely a 'warning'; attempting to impose the discipline of Constantinople on all of Christendom, East and West, seems more likely.

Thus, Western Rite Orthodoxy's canonical problem is primarily disciplinary, at least in the sense that it is related to ordering the public activity of the Church which requires consistent, though not necessarily uniform, regulation for the maintenance of good order. This maintenance of good order is a function of the council, and this would naturally include the celebration of the liturgy. Thus in one sense, the liturgy of the church is a discipline no different from the behaviour of clergy, the number of permissible marriages, or the jurisdiction of a bishop or primate. As such, the canonical norms which have been historically received can be modified, abrogated, or even outright ignored if circumstances change and necessity arises via *oikonomia*.[93] While this term is commonly applied to sacramental practice it also is applicable to canon law and in that sphere only is analogous to the *dispensatio*.[94] An excellent example of this would be clergy who have been widowed are subsequently allowed to be remarried without ecclesiastical penalty, as in the case of Joseph Allen of the Antiochian Archdiocese of North America.[95] There are many Orthodox who decry such an application of economy

[92] Gennadios Limouris 'Historical and Ecumenical Perspectives on the Penthekte Ecumenical Council', *GOTR* 40.1-2 (1995), 70.
[93] Nicholas Afanasiev, 'Canons of the Church: Changeable or Unchangable?' in *SVSQ* 11.2 (1967), esp. 62-5 where Afanasiev specifically applies his principle understanding to justify Trullo's shift from a married episcopate to an exclusively celibate one.
[94] Erickson, 'Reception of Non-Orthodox Clergy Into the Orthodox Church', *SVTQ* 29.2 (1985) 116-7.
[95] Cf. Joseph Allen, *Widowed Priest: A Crisis in Ministry* (Minneapolis: Light & Life Publishing, 1994). In this case, the subject, Joseph Allen, remarried after the death of his first wife, but was allowed by Metropolitan Philip and Patriarch Ignatios IV to retain his priestly standing, despite the canonical ban on

as unnecessary leniency. However, a strict application of the canons is certainly a rarity if there are any Orthodox churches or jurisdictions which apply the canons with consistent rigor; as such, strict application of the canons is a minority position, one which is contrary to the spirit of Orthodox canon law and is not widely practiced in any case.[96] There seems to be little reason for this strict application for the Western rite and not in other places.

Even if the canons cannot be changed, it may nevertheless be possible to allow the contrary Western practices via *oikonomia*. The problem with *oikonomia* is that it ultimately implies that there is something defective or irregular that the Church accepts or tolerates because there is some pastoral benefit. Such a designation would only enhance the identification that there is something inherently unorthodox about the Western rite since it is a problem to be tolerated rather than an authentic expression of the Church's catholicity. Furthermore, allowing that Western Rite Orthodoxy's divergent practices is the result of *oikonomia* is implicit acknowledgement that the rite is an aberration, something not native to the Orthodox Church, something to be tolerated rather than embraced, and ultimately dispensed with. That would make the Western rite vulnerable to the whim of the primate, since the ultimate validity of the rite would be how beneficial it is to the souls of the faithful, perhaps measured in how effective it is in ushering Western Christians into the Orthodox Church. In this case, if conversions to the Western rite began to decline or ceased altogether, any primate would be in a reasonable position to argue that the Western rite was no longer necessary as a living entity and thus could be dispensed with. In short, it is recognition that the Western rite is foreign and possessing some theological or ecclesiological infirmity that requires healing, just like baptisms outside the Orthodoxy which are similarly accepted through *oikonomia*. This is far from

---

second marriages for clergy. The decision was not popular with other Orthodox churches in North America, including the OCA, which removed Allen from his teaching position at St Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary.

[96] Cf. Erickson 'The Orthodox Canonical Tradition', *SVTQ* 27.3 (1983) 155-67 and 'Reception of Non-Orthodox Clergy Into the Orthodox Church', *SVTQ* 29.2 (1985) 115-32. In my own experience, I have seen canons related to the qualifications for priests violated on several occasions by different jurisdictions. One case involved a primary school friend in the Antiochian Archdiocese who was ordained below canonical age of thirty. The second case was a colleague during my Master's program who converted to Orthodoxy in the first year of his degree program and immediately thereafter began a course of study leading to the priesthood at a North American Orthodox seminary. The time from his conversion to his ordination as a deacon was less than two years. These instances are involved individuals in different Orthodox jurisdictions I personally know, but they are hardly isolated, as I have already suggested above.

being the heritage of Orthodoxy that was forgotten after the schism, as Western Rite Orthodox would claim. In truth, understanding Western Rite Orthodoxy as an example of *oikonomia* is not only stretching, but also leads down a path Western Rite Orthodox will not like.

The above methods are hardly suitable answers to Western Rite Orthodoxy's canonical problem, and it does not appear that any singular measure will alone solve the problem. Strict application of the canons would result in an unrecognizable version of the Western rite and is impractical in any case. *Oikonomia*, while seemingly attractive, would imply a more negative view of the Western rite than would be advisable. The best course is twofold: first, there must be careful consideration the reception of the council in the West. It is commonly stated, despite all the interpretative difficulties in this understanding, that for a council to be ecumenical its decrees and canons must be accepted by the whole Church, and consequently that 'the canons of the Penthekte, before they became binding, had been accepted by the conscience of the Church.'[97] There may be justification in questioning the ecumenical nature of the entirety of Trullo, as has been done historically, but perhaps it would be best to specifically reject the anti-Western canons. Emphasis on the reception of the council has tended to focus on acceptance or rejection of the council by the papacy as representing 'acceptance by the West'. Using that criteria, while Popes Sergius, John VII and John VIII definitively reject the council in one manner or another, Pope Constantine provides some acceptance while much later Pope Hadrian I acknowledges the ecumenical nature of all the canons. Simultaneously, one cannot express amazement at such a criterion for reception for two reasons: in the first place, no Westerner participated in the council and secondly it violates the Eastern understanding of the conciliar nature of the church since it reduces the entirety of the West to one bishop (that of Rome). The latter is especially troubling since no one would claim that the Bishop of Constantinople represents the entire East during the present period or at any point in history, at least not in theoretical terms. With that in mind, while there is very little to demonstrate that the Bishop of Rome accepted the council as ecumenical without any reservations, there is even less evidence that Trullo was received

[97] Limouris 'Historical and Ecumenical Perspectives on the Penthekte Ecumenical Council', *GOTR* 40.1-2 (1995), 73.

at all by other Western bishops, the Spanish exception noted above. Dură is correct that canons of Trullo are found in later Western canonical collections,[98] but we must be cautious in assuming a direct link between inclusion and reception. All eighty-five of the apostolic canons were sometimes included in Western canonical collections during the Middle Ages, but other evidence consistently states that canons fifty-one though eighty-five were not given any authority. It is therefore not unreasonable to conclude that the same situation could have occurred with relation to the Trullan canons.

Secondly, a better historical perspective is needed to explain the anti-Roman legislation within the canons of the council. Salachas concludes that the primary purpose of the council was to provide ecclesiastical uniformity within the empire by imposing the discipline of the Byzantine Church everywhere.[99] This is a conclusion which Dură also accepts,[100] while Hefele designates several canons as direct attacks on the Roman church.[101] Hefele likely has over-exaggerated the situation, but it is evident that Trullo only considers the Western tradition in passing as evidenced by Canon §2 which, in enumerating the canons which shall remain in force, omits any reference to any Western council, with the exception of Carthage (419) and Sardica (343-4), as well as an unspecified canon attributed to Cyprian.[102] Failure to consider all but the Byzantine practice is perhaps a result of Justinian's efforts to bring the recently incorporated Armenian territories into conformity with Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. In Byzantium, divergence in practice often indicated a divergence in faith. We see this point explicitly in the fight over leavened and unleavened bread in the eleventh century and in the lists of Latin errors, which are predominated by ecclesiological divergences rather than doctrinal disagreement.[103] Thus, the fathers at Trullo are attempting to create one doctrinally unified Church by imposing a uniform discipline. An additional historical factor is the shift towards Anatolia during the seventh century as territories in the Levant and North

[98] Dură, 'The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo', *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 247-0.
[99] Dimitri P. Salachas, *La Normativa del Concilio Trullano Commentata dai Canonisti Bizantini del XII Secolo* (Palermo: Oriente Cristiano, 1991), 30.
[100] Dură, 'The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo', *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 260-1.
[101] Karl J. von Hefele, *History of the Councils* V (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1972), 224n.1, 228n.2.
[102] Louth, *Greek East and Latin West*, 31. Louth attributes the lack of Western canons to 'neglect, not deliberate intent'.
[103] Cf. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 32-69.

Africa were lost to Arab conquest and the Lombards continued in forcing the Byzantine Empire out of Italy. With this shift, it should be little surprise that Byzantine and even Greek customs would dominate the canonical legislation, even at the expense of Roman and especially Armenian customs.[104]

In a very real sense, Sopko and Schmemann are both mistaken because the issue at hand is not whether or not St Stephens is abandoning the Western tradition or violating an ecumenical canon: the real question is how can Orthodox canon law, which envisions only the Byzantine rite, be applied to the Western rite and why canon law is applied selectively to the practice of the rite, leaving customs which violate the canons of an ecumenical council, such as Mass on weekdays in Lent, to stand while changing other customs which do not figure canonical legislation. This does not mean approaching the subject in a legalistic manner; rather a discernable pattern should be evident, along with a hermeneutic principle to aid in the interpretation of a canon's applicability to the Western rite. Similarly, greater attention needs to be given to the matter of how the canonical pronouncements from ecumenical councils which contradict long held Western practice are to be applied, especially when, in the case of the Council in Trullo, there is no evidence the Orthodox West ever received the canons contrary to their own practice even if professing the rest of the council to have an ecumenical character. This results in a second, though less easily answered question: what is the status of a council, even an ecumenical one, which repudiates all alternative customs and practices, even if these were the customs of a then-orthodox Chalcedonian church?

That brings us back to the meaning of the Western rite as a canonical problem: it is a canonical problem in the sense that the canons of the Orthodox Church, as they presently stand, do not envision a Western rite; indeed many canons directly repudiate Western customs of a long-standing nature, including pre-schismatic customs. Simultaneously, in the establishment of a Western rite, the applicability of various points of canonical legislation was never actually answered to any significant degree and indeed there is ample reason to think that these questions were never really asked in the first place. This leads to Schmemann to lament the various canonical deviations of the Western rite since he simply assumes that the Byzantine practice as enshrined in the

[104] Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Pope*, 220-1.

canon must overrule the Western custom; it leads Sopko to denounce what he interprets as an unnecessary intrusion of Byzantine canon law into an otherwise pristine Western rite. We should not assume that the Western rite, if it is to be authentic, can be haphazardly crammed into a Byzantine mould nor may an Orthodox Western rite be completely free from emendation. If there are good reasons to change some Western practices and not others to bring some into conformity with canonical norms, a reasonable detailing the applied hermeneutical principals should follow. It is similarly ill-advised simply to let the Western rite continue forward in its present form as a result of either uninformed laziness or outright neglect.

I have already suggested above that this is the best path because it requires the Western rite to fully develop a self-understanding of what it means to be a minority liturgical movement in a canonical tradition that does not envision its practical peculiarities, to say nothing of its mere existence. It allows the rest of the Orthodox Church to consider carefully its own position vis-à-vis the West in relation to a canonical tradition which, from the perspective of the West, has historically been seen as divisive, hostile to Western traditions, and chauvinistic regarding religious life and discipline in Byzantium. To be certain, it is not the easy path, and it is the present author's opinion that honest reflection, both on the nature of ecumenical councils generally and the ecumenicity of this council in particular, will not lead Orthodox down a road which they will like; at the very least, the end result will be a necessary repudiation of statements regarding the council relationship to the West such as those of Limouris as referenced above.

Nor are these the only questions of a canonical nature which must be asked; they are merely the only ones which directly address the canons of a council deemed to be ecumenical by Orthodoxy and studiously ignored by the West. Other questions of a canonical nature related directly to the typikon of the Church and resultant liturgical practices: is the sacramental discipline of the Orthodox Church Orthodox in itself or is it Byzantine? Must Lent start on Clean Monday because doing so is Orthodox, or may it start on any day because Clean Monday is Byzantine specifically? Is common fasting and feasting a sign of Orthodox unity or a sign of ritual unity? Are the normative fasting rules a matter of binding law or of ritual practice which can be abrogated if they are not

natively part of another rite? Schmemann presumes these are in fact matters of faith[105] and though he may be correct, he provides us with no means to follow his reasoning, at least not as regards the Western rite. Although these questions are difficult, perhaps even painful, for all those involved, the continued health of Western Rite Orthodoxy is dependent on answering, or at the very least asking, these questions, even if the answer is neither pleasant nor immediately forthcoming.

[105] Schmemann, 'Some Reflections on "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 266-7.

CHAPTER 11
THE FUTURE OF THE WESTERN RITE

In addition to the very real problems posed by Western Rite Orthodoxy which were covered in the previous chapter, there are still elements of the Western rite which, though insufficiently problematic to warrant extended theological reflection, still should not be passed over without some comment. This chapter will look at those points, question some of the Western Rite Orthodoxy's basic assumptions, and offer possible solutions, especially in the area of liturgy. Several suggestions are made in the course of the chapter, and the points range from the esoteric to the immensely practical. While these suggestions are provided, it is not expected that Western Rite Orthodox will immediately agree with any or all of them; the liturgical suggestions would likely to be disregarded because they challenge the foundation of the AWRV's liturgical practice. Rather, these points should be thought of as a means of starting the conversation rather than their final word, particularly since many of the suggestions made below are abstract even if they possess a practical application. Western Rite Orthodox will need to decide for themselves what place they desire in relation to the Orthodox Church and their Western counterparts, and this is not a decision that can be made abstractly.

Potential Threats to the Western Rite

At the present time, it appears that Western Rite Orthodoxy will be a continuing phenomenon within the life of the Orthodox Church in North America. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the Western rite has actually experienced something of a resurgence as a number of new parishes have been received into the AWRV, the majority of them coming from the Charismatic Episcopal Church. However, simply because the Western rite has grown recently does not mean that the status quo is desirable or even ultimately beneficial. The first generation of Western rite leaders is beginning to step aside for a younger generation or have already died. A new vicar general was appointed

for the AWRV in 2009 following Schneirla's long tenure as Vicar General, so perhaps this presents as opportune time as ever to consider the future of the Western rite with regards to the potential troubles that may be encountered.

Though the status of Western Rite Orthodoxy within the AWRV is seemingly secure with the canonical protection of a sympathetic hierarch, this should not lead anyone to think that this stability is perpetually assured. Presently, Metropolitan Philip is supportive of the Western rite, receiving new Western rite parishes and allowing existing parishes to continue functioning. However, if there is one thing that history teaches us, it is that the Western Rite within Orthodoxy is usually small and its stability is tenuous at best. Sopko speaks of a systemic anti-Western bias as existing in Orthodoxy, and to a certain extent, he is probably correct.[1] Though good will does exist in some quarters, there is still opposition towards Western Rite Orthodoxy within the North American churches, notably the OCA and the Greek Archdiocese. At the very least, there is a fair bit of misinformation and overt hostility which is passed around on avenues like the internet. Moreover, hierarchical support cannot be considered absolutely reliable. This is a lesson the clergy of Sts Peter and Paul Orthodox Church, formerly a part of the archdiocese's Evangelical Orthodox Mission, learned all too well in 1998 in a series of events that are still not well known and which still elicit damaged feelings. Ostensibly, based on inference, the entirety of the crisis was due to the liturgical irregularity that Sts Peter and Paul Church in Ben Lomond, California represented within the Archdiocese.[2] In large part, these differences consisted of the number and length of services offered (with the parish offering Matins, Divine Liturgy, and Vespers on a daily basis within the

[1] Sopko 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Case Study and Reappraisal', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 255-65. In private conversations, this has at least been confirmed on more than one occasion with many individuals expressing disdain for all things Western. One comment that particularly stands out was the thought that the Western rite should be abandoned but if Nestorians or Monophysites were to join the Orthodox Church *en masse* that they should continue to use their native rites. Further anti-Western bias, even in North America, is perhaps best illustrated with regards to receiving convert clergy. Roman Catholic clergy who are received into Orthodoxy may be 1) received in orders after repudiation of errors, 2) christmated and received in orders, or 3) baptized, christmated and, if found worthy, ordained. By contrast, non-Chalcedonian clergy are almost uniformly received in orders after repudiation of error. Why Roman Catholics, who at least share the Chalcedonian faith, should be subjected to a different means of reception than non-Chalcedonians is an ecclesiological peculiarity that is never really addressed consistently, but perhaps further indicative of a pervasive anti-Western bias that Sopko suggests.

[2] The fullest neutral account of Ben Lomond is George Michalopulos and Herb Ham, *The American Orthodox Church: A History of Its Beginnings* (Salisbury: Regina Orthodox Press, 2004), 117ff., though even here the account is very short.

bounds of canon law) and the use of liturgical music other than the Byzantine-Arab tradition.[3] Without going into detail, the decision of Bishop Joseph and Metropolitan Philip to alter the liturgical life of the parish caused a major disruption in the Archdiocese and resulted in a schism which is still felt to this day, all due to the two parties inability to communicate effectively. The lesson for the Western rite is apparent since it would be very easy for the Bishop and a Western rite parish to come to a similar misunderstanding in the course of a dispute between the parish and the bishop.

The case of the Ben Lomond parish is especially interesting because liturgical matters played such an important role in its downfall. When the Evangelical Orthodox Church entered the Antiochian Archdiocese, they were told by Metropolitan Philip that they would be permitted to retain their distinctive uses, though in just over a decade this promise was no longer honoured. While there were greater factors in the Ben Lomond division than just liturgical, the liturgical matters did have a significant role, particularly that Sts Peter and Paul had liturgical practices which differed from the rest of the Archdiocese. Additionally, there are other factors to consider: Sts Peter and Paul had recently been placed into the regular diocesan framework after having been separate from other parishes by virtue of their having been a part of the Evangelical Orthodox Mission, non of which had been a part of the Archdiocese for many years in any case. All of these elements do legitimately distinguish the Ben Lomond parish from the situation of parishes of the AWRV. However, since liturgical variation was a significant contributing factor to the collapse of Sts Peter and Paul, the event itself should be a sobering thought to Western rite clergy and faithful, as they use an entirely different rite. Though Metropolitan Philip has promised that Western rite parishes will not be forced to use the Byzantine rite,[4] this does not preclude a future Metropolitan who is not nearly as supportive of the AWRV from revoking that promise, nor does it preclude Metropolitan Philip from changing his mind in the future. It also does not prevent Eastern rite bishops, clergy, and laity from exerting a sort of 'peer pressure' on Western rite parishes to adopt the Byzantine rite and treating the Western rite as an anomaly to be corrected.

---

[3] There are other factors, to be certain, not the least of which is was the willingness to seek spiritual guidance from members of other canonical Orthodox jurisdictions and a persistent increase in the number of 'ethnic' Orthodox who joined the parish in the years after its reception into the Archdiocese.

[4] Metropolitan Philip Saliba, '*Archpastoral Directive on the Western Rite*', 27 November 1979.

A more direct example is the situation of parishes within the ECOF and its relationship with her various canonical sponsors. In each instance, the leading hierarch of a national Orthodox Church would take the ECOF under his omophorion, only to have a successor unceremoniously dispatch them at a later date. The conflict between Bishop Germain and Patriarch Teoctist still has not been healed, and the separation between the ECOF and the Romanian Church led to further schism within the ECOF; presently, some former ECOF parishes have returned to canonical Orthodoxy under the Serbian Church, but as Byzantine rite parishes. In North America, the 1979 ROCA suppression of the Western rite has been reversed. However, the present status of Western Rite Orthodoxy in the ROCOR is significantly reduced from 1979 levels, with only one functioning parish in North America, and this a bi-ritual parish (St Benedict, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma) which celebrates the Western liturgy infrequently. Western Rite Orthodoxy within the Antiochian Archdiocese may not be in as dire a position vis-à-vis the ROCOR Western rite parishes or even the ECOF, but that does not diminish the need for awareness that the Western rite is in a precarious position. Without an extensive survey, it is difficult to gauge the opinions of the current Antiochian hierarchy much less their potential successors in the current parish clergy. Even if the entire Antiochian hierarchy in North America is supportive of the Western rite at this point and Metropolitan Philip is committed to keeping the Western rite, there is no indication that a successor would feel similarly committed. The attitude of a potential successor to Metropolitan Philip becomes extremely important considering that the recent decisions from Antioch have seemingly stripped considerable authority from diocesan bishops in North America.[5]

Furthermore, even if the Antiochian hierarchy is supportive of the Western rite and Philip's ultimate successor was committed to the Western rite does not preclude potential trouble. An equally unknown quantity is the hierarchy and clergy of other jurisdictions in North America. Some within the hierarchy of these jurisdictions have made their feelings known overtly, such as Bishop Anthony of San Francisco or Metropolitan Isaiah of Denver, while the majority have been more passive. This may be because the Western rite does not directly affect them at the present time. That would

[5] Cf. Holy Synod of Antioch, 'The Decision Regarding the Amending of Articles Concerning Bishops According to the By-Laws of the Patriarchate', 24 February 2009. <<http://www.antiochian.org/sites/antiochian.org/files/Decision%20(English)%20of%20Synod%20of%20Antioch%202-24-09.pdf>>

change if substantive progress towards ecclesiastical unity in North America were made. While we have already seen why the Western rite should not a bar to eventual jurisdictional unification, it is a theoretical perspective that may be pushed aside by emotion or gut reaction in reality. Jurisdictional union is coming to North American Orthodoxy, if for no other reason than there is a desire for jurisdictional unity. Though the last concrete step towards pan-Orthodox unity was the 1994 at the Lingonier meeting, it has not stopped talk of unity on both a large and small scale. While unity is certain, what form it will take is not. In 2003, the Antiochian Archdiocese and the OCA spoke of possible jurisdictional unity,[6] but the Ecumenical Patriarchate has continued to demand the canonical submission of all Orthodox jurisdictions in North America to its representative.[7] While Metropolitan Jonah has spoken positively of the Western rite since his election as primate of the OCA,[8] the opinion of Archbishop Demitrios of the Ecumenical Patriarchate remains unknown, though it unlikely to be positive. If unity is accomplished between the Antiochians and the OCA, the prospects for the Western rite are shaky, but parishes under sympathetic bishops may survive provided they are not first sacrificed for the sake of unity. If the Ecumenical Patriarchate becomes the vehicle for unity, the Western rite will almost surely face immediate pressure to Byzantinise, if outright suppression of the Western rite is not made a precondition for unity.

What can Western Rite Orthodox do in this situation? This author is not sure that there is anything that the Western rite can do to prevent potential suppression. Certainly, educating Orthodox faithful and clergy in North America would be a helpful start, especially beginning with their own jurisdiction. Another possibility would be the selection of a Western rite bishop the next time a vacancy in the North American hierarchy exists. Mott urges caution against creating a bishop for the Western rite since placing all Western rite parishes under his care would 'make it difficult for western rite parishes to have a normal relationship with the rest of the Church.'[9] In this point, he is certainly correct that organizational separation will only hasten a possible downfall of the Western rite. However, there is a distinct difference between creating a bishop *for* the

[6] Thomas Hopko, 'Making Unity Happen', *The Word* 49.8 (2005) 21-2.
[7] Lambriniadis, 'Challenges of Orthodoxy in America and the Role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate'.
[8] Jonah Paffhausen, 'Pan-Orthodox Lenten Vespers Sermon', St Seraphim Orthodox Cathedral, Dallas, Texas, 5 April 2009.
[9] Mott, 'Some Perspectives on the Western Rite – I', *SVTQ* 26.2 (1982) 123.

Western rite and creating a bishop *from* the Western rite. The former would have extra-geographical responsibility for Western rite parishes within the Archdiocese, removing them from the normal diocesan framework. The latter suggestion would provide a hierarch for a given geographical location that happens to be from the Western rite; such an individual would have responsibility for eastern and western parishes within his diocese and could be an advocate for the Western rite to his fellow bishops.[10] This is, of course, only one solution and is ultimately something which the Western rite has no control over. Can an individual of sufficient vision, articulation, and passion for the Western rite be found who is also adequately knowledgeable of the Eastern liturgical tradition and meets the qualifications for the episcopate? Are there any Western rite priests who meet the qualifications for the episcopate, all else aside? Even if such a man were available, even at the least desirable level, that does not guarantee his election or the elections ratification by the Holy Synod of Antioch. Both times the Antiochian hierarchy was increased in the last two decades, no Western rite clergy were selected for the episcopate, despite the fact that there were two unmarried, active priests at the time the vacancies arose.

Even if the Western rite would survive a jurisdictional merger, it is this author's opinion that some changes to the present Western rite are needed, especially in the realm of liturgics. Though retaining the Tridentine rite may be seen as best or even non-negotiable, the liturgical texts for the other sacramental rites are in serious need of a thorough revision. This is the most serious point of need, and the process of careful revision should be put off any longer, though this author harbours no illusions that the subject will be taken up any time soon. Other priorities, like establishing a more formal training program for the next generation of Western rite clergy, have been mentioned in the past, but have only been implemented on an *ad hoc* basis.[11] A more formal training program, one with a firm basis in genuine liturgical scholarship for its own sake rather than the purpose of polemic will go a long way towards meeting future problems. To be viable, Western Rite Orthodoxy cannot hope to continue recruiting new parishes from

[10] This is the purpose of Bishop Basil who is currently the Archiepiscopal Vicar for the Western rite, though Bishop Basil is an Eastern rite hierarch.

[11] For formal proposals for Western rite seminaries or study programs, see Patrick McCauley, 'Proposal for the Establishment of a House of Western-Rite Orthodox Studies', *Credo* (April, 1994), 30.

outside Orthodoxy to replace those which become Byzantine rite when they can find no new Western rite priest to serve as pastor.

Ultimately, while the Western rite is secure enough to speak of as an established phenomenon, its future is by no means secure. Much of what could be done to secure the future of the Western rite may end up causing problems. If too many parishes become Western rite that would simply make for more attention within and without Orthodoxy, most of that attention being undesirable. The Western rite would be a victim of its own success. Keeping one's head down will only ensure that the Western rite is subjected to a benign neglect in the short term and viewed as expendable in any future jurisdictional unification negotiations. Doubtless, fools will rush in where angels fear to tread.

The Evangelistic Potential of the Western Rite

In the immediate aftermath of Vatican II and for quite some time thereafter, Western Rite Orthodoxy was promoted as a stable alternative to the controversies that arose within North American Christianity, particularly the Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches. Western Rite Orthodoxy was a safe harbour, a haven from strife, where the ancient apostolic tradition was guarded inviolate and where the historic forms of Western liturgy would be preserved.[12] The Western rite was an evangelistic tool, a means of reaching out to the disaffected and showing them an alternative to the liturgical controversy they were experiencing. However, things have changed in the fifty years since *NOM* and the forty years since the 1979 American *BCP* and the *Lutheran Book of Worship* were introduced. The liturgies themselves have had mixed results. Some, like the *Lutheran Book of Worship* have been extremely successful and, rather than being a cause of schism, was a vehicle for church union in North American Lutheranism.[13] The 1979 American *BCP* has been successful in that only a few instances of schism have arisen from its use; *NOM*'s success is perhaps more mixed, but there has only been one significant schism attributed to the new rite.[14]

[12] McCauley, 'Why Would an Episcopalian Become Orthodox' in Tirgg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 12-3.
[13] Pfatteicher, *Commentary on the Lutheran Book of Worship*, 509.
[14] This would be the schism caused by Marcel Lefebvre when he ordained four priests as bishops without the approval of the Vatican in 1988. Lefebvre's concerns were more than the promulgation of *NOM*, though the new liturgy was clearly something he opposed. Additionally, Lefebvre and the men he ordained

Using Western Rite Orthodoxy as a 'safe haven' from the ecclesial problems in the West has posted a rather anaemic showing at best. Part of that is attributable to a lack of schisms over the liturgy, despite the sometimes dire predictions of mass defections that were seen in some quarters immediately after the new rites were issued. Lutherans, as has already been indicated, have gone on largely undisturbed through a second liturgical book, as well as two separate ritual supplements. Traditionalists Catholics who left the Roman Catholic Church frequently did so not because of rite, though this was important, but because the rite was seen as a symptom of greater doctrinal laxity, especially as regarded the ecclesiological exclusivity of the Roman Catholic Church. Such individuals and parishes were therefore unlikely to look to the East as an acceptable substitute since they often had a high view of the papacy, even if it was only theoretical. It is perhaps significant that the only parish known to come from a Roman Catholic background was St Augustine's in Denver, and even this parish was originally founded in one of the many 'Old Catholic' *vagante* jurisdictions in North America.

The majority of parishes that constitute Western Rite Orthodoxy have come from The Episcopal Church. However, even here Western Rite Orthodoxy competes with a number of different groups which have broken off from the Episcopal Church and have formed an alternative to the Anglican Communion. These so-called Continuing Anglican Churches are in many ways more attractive than Western Rite Orthodoxy since they are focused on a theological dispute rather than a liturgical one. These Churches have largely kept their Anglican ethos intact and that was precisely the purpose: to remain Anglican while distancing themselves from what they saw as the ever growing heresy of The Episcopal Church. Western Rite Orthodoxy, at least nominally, represents an abandonment of Anglicanism in terms of ecclesiology and theology.

So the mass defections that were expected never came to pass, and where some limited schism did occur, very little of it went to Western Rite Orthodoxy. However, times have changed since Vatican II, with the liturgy being one of the primary areas where circumstances have radically shifted. Once, *NOM* was the 'innovation' and the

---

as bishops were the only ones who incurred automatic excommunication and the ordinations, while regarded as a schismatic act, were not considered to have established a parallel hierarchy and thus did not technically constitute schism, even if this is how the incident is popularly considered by those who are not a part of the Society of St Pius X.

Tridentine rite was 'the liturgy' for everyone. Now, for anyone under the age of forty or who converted within the last forty years, these are the rites of their Church, the rite they have always known; *NOM* is the 'the liturgy' and the Tridentine rite is the 'innovation'. That was a development that seems obvious in and of itself since an older generation eventually would die out to be replaced by another, but it was a development that seems to have taken the Western Rite Orthodox by surprise. Even as late as 2000, AWRV publications were still appealing to Western Christians to come to Western Rite Orthodoxy because they used the real liturgy and not the innovative one. Such appeals continue on the internet even to the present day, but such an appeal is hopelessly out of date. And things have changed with regards to the status of the Tridentine rite in the Roman Catholic Church. While Paul VI had intended the rite to be wholly abrogated except under very precise circumstances, both John Paul II and Benedict XVI have gradually liberalized the use of the Tridentine rite. How significantly this will affect the internal life of the Roman Catholic Church is unknown, especially since the Missal of Paul VI remains the ordinary form of the Roman rite. Certainly, it cannot help Western Rite Orthodoxy's appeal the liturgically disaffected.

As Western Rite Orthodoxy continues forward, it is unlikely that the liturgical appeal will meet success much longer. Anyone potentially motivated to abandon the Episcopal, Lutheran, or Roman Catholic churches has done so already; those who remained behind did so either because of or in spite of the liturgical changes. It is unlikely that the Western rite will have much success with these groups. Younger Anglicans and Roman Catholics are similarly unlikely sources for mass conversions on this point. Consequently, the liturgical question has been replaced with other questions of theology and ecclesiology, notably the ordination of active homosexual clergy, typified in the 2003 election of Gene Robinson as Bishop of New Hampshire in the Episcopal Church. Lutherans, Methodists, and Presbyterians are all currently engaged in the question, though the issue is less pressing in the Roman Catholic Church due to mandatory clerical celibacy. There is an opportunity for Western Rite Orthodoxy to reach out to the disaffected among these churches, here again offering them a safe haven from calamity, yet it is unlikely the appeal will have significant effect. Liturgy is now a factor as Western Rite Orthodoxy inadvertently positioned itself as a standard bearer for

Tridentine-style Anglo-Catholicism, a liturgical ideology foreign to most Methodists and Presbyterians; liturgically, Lutherans in North America presently owe as much to the Eastern Orthodox as they do to Anglicanism and their own liturgical practice, so the Anglo-Catholic appeal is vastly limited. Furthermore, the question of ordaining homosexually active clergy is only really felt in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the United Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church (USA), and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); each of these churches are colloquially referred to as 'liberal', and each has a 'conservative' counterpart in the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, the Wesleyan Church, Presbyterian Church in America, and the Churches of Christ, respectively. Unlike the Anglican Communion, there is a place for disaffected parishes to go without having to give up their sense of identity by abandoning a worldwide communion.

The majority of new Western rite parishes over the last decade have been drawn from the Charismatic Episcopal Church. Despite the similarity of names, there is actually no historic relationship between The Episcopal Church and the Charismatic Episcopal Church. The latter, founded in 1992, developed in the convergence movement of the late 1970s through the early 1990s in North America. The convergence movement called for a blend of charismatic and evangelical beliefs with liturgical worship and grounding in the historic Christian tradition.[15] Liturgically, the Charismatic Episcopal Church used the 1979 American *BCP* and is presently attempting to develop a sacramentary which can best be described as 'blended'; a minority used the 1928 American *BCP*, and even a few who use the Byzantine rite.[16] Most of the conversions to Orthodoxy in the last several years were prompted by divisions within the Charismatic Episcopal Church itself, including one attempt of an archdiocese attempting to leave communion in 2006. However, the conversions from the Charismatic Episcopal Church are distinct in that they have not come about because of some weighty theological disagreement or change to the

[15] One other group which deserves mention, though it was significantly smaller than the Charismatic Episcopal Church, is the Evangelical Orthodox Church. This latter body, which in many ways served as the foundation and model for the convergence movement, adopted the Byzantine rite and sought a closer relationship with the Orthodox Church. Most of the group was received into the Antiochian Archdiocese in 1987 as the Antiochian Evangelical Orthodox Mission, with a smaller group received into the OCA in 2002, while seven parishes retain an independent existence using the original name.

[16] Cf. Charismatic Episcopal Church, 'Book of Common Prayer'. <<http://www.bookofcommonprayer.net/index.php>> accessed 21 April 2009.

liturgy, especially since most of the parishes recently received would have used the 1979 American *BCP*. Rather, the Charismatic Episcopal Church represents the kind of splintering effect common in evangelical Christianity when denominations begin to break up: some stay with the original group, some break off to form a new group, and sometimes individual parishes splinter from both sides, choosing to go it alone because neither faction represents a good fit any longer. This phenomenon will continue for a while, but it is unlikely that the Charismatic Episcopal Church will continue to provide a new source of converts into the next decade as the present schism becomes solidified. In all likelihood, those who will come to the Orthodox Church have already arrived or are at least well on their way.

It is also worthwhile to consider the targets of Western rite evangelistic activity. Primarily, evangelization is directed towards those Western Christians who are already disaffected with their present communions or denominations for one reason or another. But this begs the question: is attempting to woo the already disaffected a worthwhile or sustainable strategy? Furthermore, if Western Rite Orthodoxy's primary attraction is that it looks and sounds like the Episcopal Church or the Roman Catholic Church before everything 'went wrong', regardless of whatever a particular malcontent views as wrong, does that mean there is something inherently dishonest about the Western rite or about how Western Rite Orthodoxy presents itself to the target audience? Literature produced by the AWRV at least attempts to wrestle with the first question in a small way by reminding converts that despite their high expectations, Orthodoxy is not without its share of quarrels,[17] but that does not really address the wisdom of such evangelistic tactics. The second question is even more pertinent since it really cuts to the heart of what Western Rite Orthodoxy has made itself to be: a haven for those Western Christians who lost touch with the rest of their coreligionists. The starry-eyed recollections of the West's glorious pre-Vatican II life do not help diminish this perception. Rather, it only lends the impression that Western Rite Orthodox converts chose Orthodoxy out of a lack of better options in their own communion or in isolation rather than from any real acquaintance with Orthodox theology or life, leading to potential accusations that Western Rite Orthodox are converts who never actually underwent conversion.

[17] AWRV, 'Practical Tips for Moving to Western Rite Orthodoxy', 14.

While the evangelical potential is often provided as one of its strengths, and indeed one of its benefits, the potential is one that has yet to be fully realized. Part of the problem is that Western Rite Orthodoxy's self-presentation as a liturgical sub-group in resistance against liturgical changes that are no longer either controversial or even exotic; this is particularly true since Western Rite Orthodoxy's greatest appeal has been to Anglicans and those, like the Charismatic Episcopal Church, who possess some superficial links to the Anglican tradition. Thus, the primary appeal of Western Rite Orthodoxy is not liturgical, but doctrinal since Orthodoxy presents itself as having maintained the apostolic tradition unbroken.[18] It would seem that Western Rite Orthodoxy's recent evangelistic successes have been in spite of itself rather than because of how the Western rite is presented to potentially disgruntled Western Christians. As those disaffected with liturgical changes made over forty years ago becomes increasingly smaller, Western Rite Orthodoxy will need to find another means to appeal to Western Christians of a new generation if it intends to sustain itself through conversions. Time may prove that the Western rite has little evangelistic appeal to future generations of Westerners if the Western rite does not find a more relevant message.

Liturgical Reform and the Western Rite

As we have already seen, the rejection of liturgical reform after Vatican II can best be described as reactionary. Indeed, there are many positive elements to the reform as it was enacted, though there are still elements in *NOM* which, from an Orthodox standpoint, would require correction. On the other hand, the Tridentine rite was not perfect either, certainly not in maintenance of the 'Roman genius': the preference for sobriety, succinctness, and tightly formed prayer units so characteristic of the Roman Rite during the time of St Gregory. At the very least, Western Rite Orthodox have acknowledged these problems implicitly by accepting some of the alterations that were made immediately prior to Vatican II, and we saw in the previous chapter why most arguments against *NOM* are ultimately inadequate, especially the implicit belief that the Tridentine liturgy was best expression of the Roman rite rather than anything from the

[18] That is certainly view expressed by Patrick McCauley, 'Why Would an Episcopalian Become Orthodox' in Trigg (ed.), *Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 13.

other eras of Christian history. However, Western Rite Orthodoxy's liturgy still possesses many of the same problems as the Tridentine rite or the 1928 American *BCP*, in addition to new problems introduced by modifying the text to make it Orthodox, so the need for reform is still apparent.

So what would an Orthodox reform of the Roman rite actually look like? The first and most obvious reform would be in the area of the translation of the rite. The liturgies are almost exclusively celebrated in English, and that English translation of GRE is derived from the St Andrew's Missal and the Liberal Catholic Missal. What is needed is a fresh translation of the Roman rite, one with a specifically Orthodox character. Here the suggestions of both Eamon Duffy and John Baldovin will be useful for the sake of balance. Duffy has recommended a more careful, more literal translation of the liturgy into English, though still using modern English.[19] However, Baldovin's caution against slavishly copying the original Latin should receive its due as well since translating word for word from Latin can often result in English that looks good 'on paper' but is difficult to use in a spoken form or is just confusing.[20] Such a translation should be careful in its application of Elizabethan English. That should not be read as a statement of defeat but an acknowledgement that language is persistently developing and our public use of language needs to keep a certain pace. Certainly, Elizabethan English can have its place even in a modern liturgy since much of that style is ingrained in the psyche of English speaking Christians. By way of example, most people could probably recite *Pater Noster* in Elizabethan English without effort, but it would require significant effort to recite the same prayer in Modern English. The same is probably also true for Psalm 22(23). However, uninhibited use of Elizabethan English can lead to confusing statements which are largely incomprehensible to a modern audience; thus, it is perhaps best if marriage liturgies no longer required the 'bridegroom' to 'plight [his] troth' but instead allowed the 'groom' to make a 'solemn vow of [his] fidelity' or something equally noble but far more intelligible. For very familiar texts, the older translations can and should be retained while less familiar texts could be slightly updated to fit the modern use of English: 'thee,' 'thou,' and 'thy' could be retained, but perhaps 'saith' should simply be rendered as

[19] Duffy, 'Rewriting the Liturgy: The Theological Implications of Translation' in Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic*, 97-126.
[20] Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy,* 116-24.

'says'. It may be worthwhile to consider the English of the Revised Standard Bible as the linguistic standard rather than that of the King James Bible.

Second, a reformed Western rite should take the liturgical books of *NOM* more seriously than they have to the present. For all the defects of the English translation, the Latin typical edition has not succumbed to nearly as many of the supposed modernistic ideas as the English translations. For that matter, *NOM* makes excellent use of ancient Roman texts for the variable prayers, and their use in *NOM* should not be an occasion for prejudicial treatment. The most obvious benefit is that it would allow the Western Rite Orthodox to have a useful conversation with other Western Churches, many of whom have revised their rites at least once (in some cases, twice) since the close of Vatican II and the promulgation of the Missal of Paul VI. The removal of some medieval and baroque oddities is not without its merits, including the removal of the Last Gospel from the rite.[21]

Third, TIK should be eliminated altogether. Such a suggestion will certainly have very little support among former Anglicans who make up the majority of Western rite faithful in the AWRV, but there are good reasons for concluding that it is simply best to abandon TIK. In the first place, to bring the liturgy into conformity with *RO* would require remaking the rite over into the Roman rite. As it exists now, TIK is essentially a liturgical twin of GRE which is to be expected since the *BCP* began life as a modified version of the Roman rite and *The Anglican Missal*, as we saw in Chapter 4, is a deliberate attempt to mimic the Tridentine missal. Certainly, there are differences between TIK and GRE: the collect for purity, the summary of the law, the prayer for Christ's Church, the comfortable words, and the prayer of humble access all occur in TIK but not in GRE. Substantively, most of these elements are not significant differences between the rites. Some of the elements, such as reading the Decalogue or the summation of the law, are Cranmerian institutions which have no precedent in the Western liturgy and could be eliminated.

For that matter, TIK exists in something of liturgical isolation. That is to say, aside from the Morning Prayer and Evensong, no other materials have been brought into Western Rite Orthodox from the 1928 American *BCP*. All the forms for administering

[21] Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* II, 450.

the other sacraments were taken directly from *Rituale Romanum*, and this seems both a deliberate and desirable choice since the various editions of *Rituale Romanum* were fuller than their Anglo-Catholic counterparts. The sole exception is the marriage rite which, in the *SASB*, has retained the familiar opening of 'dearly beloved'. Taking into account the comments in Chapter 10 about the nature of rite, it is quite easy to conclude that there is lack for forms resembling the prayerbook would exclude TIK from consideration as a true rite of its own. Certainly, a viable counter argument may be that BAS and CHR are very similar to one another and no one has considered that one ought to supplant the other. However, this supplanting is precisely what occurred in the history of both rites, which is why BAS is only celebrated ten times in the course of a year.[22] In the third place, strictly from the standpoint of fairness, there seems little reason why Anglicans and Roman Catholics may have a purified liturgy and not, for example, Lutheran. Lutherans are of course Western Christians and have their own distinct liturgical expressions of that Western tradition. There seems to be no specific reason why Anglicans need an Orthodox rite based on the prayerbook and why Lutherans do not deserve the same based on *The Service Book and Hymnal* or the *Lutheran Book of Worship*. Finally, TIK has never been able to overcome the charges that it is a 'protestant' liturgy in disguise, and that will last as long as this liturgy remains in use.

Therefore, the best solution is to either eliminate TIK altogether or begin with the original sources in the 1928 American *BCP* as they exist and bring them into greater conformity with requirements of *RO*. That would include not only the liturgical rites but would require that due attention be given to the office and to the celebration of the other sacraments as they exist in 1928 American *BCP*. This would provide a rite that is whole within itself rather than a eucharistic liturgy which is inadequately fused to *Rituale Romanum*. An equally valid choice, and this author's preference, would be to simply eliminate TIK altogether, providing for one eucharistic liturgy within Western Rite Orthodoxy. Some of the more distinctive prayers from TIK, such as the collect for purity, could be kept as options, perhaps for penitential seasons, but otherwise there would be one liturgical. Additionally, it should not be replaced with the Sarum use, since it would

[22] And some of the similarity between the two liturgies is probably the result of deliberate attempts to bring them into greater textual conformity at certain points rather than an example of dependence of one upon the other.

ultimately suffer from the same problem as TIK when compared to GRE: they are essentially the same in large measure save the inclusion of additional prayers in the Sarum use which could be easily provided for as an option without necessitating the printing of a separate ordinary and collector. If the inclusion of multiple and unique Western liturgies are desired to provide more options, a better place to look would be to the Celtic, Ambrosian, or Mozarabic sources. Even still, this requires a careful pastoral implementation for bringing the canonical regulations of the various rites into harmony with each other where the Roman rite conflicts with other rites.[23]

Fourth, the Byzantinisation which has taken place in the Western rite should be seriously reconsidered and, ideally, eliminated altogether. Here, I speak most strenuously on the subject of the epiclesis. As is demonstrated in Chapter 8, the Roman rite already possess an epicelsis of sufficient orthodoxy and antiquity that is greater than presently celebrated Eastern liturgy, Orthodox or not. To deny epicletic nature *supplices* while simultaneously inserting a Byzantine epiclesis only serves to restate that there is something inherently defective about the Roman canon and it continues the post-Florentine polemics which were themselves skewed versions of the common tradition of East and West. While it is correct that some changes are needed to make several of the liturgies conform to Orthodox theology, such changes do not need to be made by inserting something from the Byzantine rite into the Western rite. Therefore, Byzantine interpolations like the triple amen or the prayer 'I believe and confess' should be dropped. This latter is especially troubling because it was inserted specifically to provide commonality between the two rites.[24] These types of Byzantinisations should certainly be eliminated from the rite since they appeal to banality rather than substantive liturgical orthopraxy or sound theology.

Finally, an authoritative printing of the liturgical books by the archdiocese is required, one which would abrogate the *SASB* and *TOM*. Ideally, this new book or series of books would incorporate the above mentioned liturgical changes, but would also provide everything needful for the proper celebration of all the western rites and

[23] For example, within the Ambrosian rite, Advent is kept for six weeks rather than the four weeks that is typical of the rest of the Western liturgies. Thus, it would be of necessity to determine which practice would be followed and why, either the Ambrosian and Roman practice, or that the two would be allowed to stand side-by-side and how to address the differences of ritual discipline.

[24] It is all the more troubling considering that the embolism's banality even in a Byzantine context.

ceremonies. Understandably, a single volume could quickly become unwieldy and it would be unfit for congregational use in any case. Therefore, it might be desirable to print a service book containing all the rites in their ordinary form (that is, the ordinary of mass, the ordinary of the office, and the ordinary for celebration of the sacraments) with a hymnal for congregational use. A sacramentary consisting a combined missal and ritual for use by the celebrant would contain all the necessary propers for the entire year but only one would be required for each parish. Finally, a book of hours for the celebration of the office would also be necessary, but this could be a slim volume with the ordinary, weekly and festal Psalters, and propers for each day included, with the readings left taken from the Bible rather than printed directly into the volume.

Conclusions

The potential future progress for the Western rite is provided as an outsider with a specific theoretical interest in the Western rite. The comments made are those of an outsider observer considering where the Western rite should go, what would be the best course for the Western rite from an abstract point of view. This is no indication of impartiality, especially in the area of liturgy as obviously indicated by the recommendation to use a modification of *NOM* rather than retaining the current Tridentine rites. Simultaneously, though I could be accused of bias by those simply unwilling to hear the points made, it is this author's hope that thoughtful Western Rite Orthodox would take the considerations provided specifically in this chapter and throughout the present work for what they are: suggestions. There are certainly sufficient reasons for Western rite faithful to consider their future seriously, both where they would like to go and where they believe the Holy Spirit is leading them. The points above and throughout this work are points of departure for starting that conversation based on present research and not the only possible path for success.

CHAPTER 12
CONCLUSIONS

The present study began by asking two questions: 'what, if anything, in Western Rite Orthodoxy is in conflict with Orthodox spirituality' and 'at what point of modification does the Western rite cease to be Western'. In the preceding, we have attempted to come to some conclusions about the state of Western Rite Orthodoxy, most specifically the form found in the AWRV, but we can also draw more general conclusions about the concept of Western Rite Orthodoxy as a whole. Answering these questions, if only tentatively, is really the beginning of longer term possibilities for the study of Western Rite Orthodoxy; thus, in light of the tentative conclusions to the two questions above, a third question begins to emerge: 'and where should we go from here'.

Can There Really be Truly Orthodox, Truly Western Rite?

Leo Davis makes the observation that the Christological settlement of the Fourth Ecumenical Council (that Christ is fully human and fully divine) was a Western solution to what was essentially an Eastern problem, and it took a while for the East to come to wholeheartedly accept this alien flavour in their theological diet.[1] Due to the way the liturgical and canonical tradition evolved in the East, and how it has been implemented, it certainly seems the same can be said about the Western rite in Orthodoxy. In one sense, Schmemann is correct in stating the opinion that to be Orthodox is to be Byzantine since the Orthodox East knows no other rite than those of Constantinople and thereby has little recourse to other rites as a source of theology. As such, to truly be Orthodox, the rite, whether it be Byzantine or Western, must express Orthodox theology. In the case of the Western rite, that necessarily means that elements which contradict the Eastern understanding of Christianity must be excised, even if they have been in the liturgy from

[1] Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils*, 207.

the beginning, even if they are well beloved devotions of the West. We see this most clearly in the liturgies for chrismation and marriage.

By one standard, for the rite to be 'Western' it must be as free from alteration, based on whatever intention, as possible. This is why the decision to develop Western Orthodoxy as a 'safe haven' from the process of liturgical change in the Western churches, especially The Episcopal Church, is itself fundamentally flawed. Those individuals who came to Orthodoxy via the Western Rite after the 1970's did so as a means of preserving their cherished liturgical rites from what they considered as heretical meddling, from what they viewed as overthrowing of two millennia of Christian tradition. Fundamentally, as Western Rite Orthodoxy is constituted now, there is a choice between whether the liturgy will be fully Orthodox and thus subject to liturgical amendment without hesitation or reservation, or if the liturgy will be fully Western, resisting as much change as possible, even if such a change is necessary to bring the rite more fully in line with Orthodox theology. To date, Western Rite Orthodox have done so in an uneven and arguably arbitrary manner, and so long as the Western rite construes itself as a 'resistance movement' against *NOM*, breaking out of this false dichotomy will not happen any time soon.

This is not to suggest that it is impossible for there to be an Orthodox Western Rite, only that the models that have been chosen thus far are insufficient to that task. In the first place, it must be admitted that the rite does need correction to make it Orthodox, and these corrections are more than just minor items such as removing the *filioque*. Indeed, as has been argued already, some of the changes that were made to the Western rite eucharistic liturgy were unnecessary (especially the epiclesis), while other changes that were important were omitted, and other liturgies were modified badly. Secondly, it should also be admitted that the path the AWRV has taken with regards to liturgy is a difficult one to maintain, primarily because Orthodoxy, again to reference Schememann, should not be a haven for individuals to preserve this or that favoured item against encroachment within their former communions.[2] For that matter, this results in a slippery slope since the natural flow of argument has been that the Tridentine forms are more Orthodox than *NOM*, but the logical conclusion would be than a liturgical use which

[2] Schmemann, 'Some Reflections Upon "A Case Study"', *SVTQ* 24.4 (1980) 268.

survived more or less in tact from before 1054 is consequently even closer to Orthodoxy than the Tridentine rite. And there are proponents of the revised Sarum rites who have made precisely this argument. Thus, those who have supported the Tridentine rite against *NOM*, even if out of love for the rite, may have inadvertently sowed the seeds for its eventual elimination within the Orthodox Church.

There are a great many factors which go into answer thing original question of if the Orthodox Western rite is fully Orthodox or fully Western. Certainly, there are theological problems with the liturgies that are used by the Western Rite Orthodox, and these items should be corrected. As to the matter of if the Orthodox Western Rite remains Western, there is perhaps an opportunity to approach a firmer answer. At the very least, Western Rite Orthodoxy has lost touch with its 'Westernness' through directly denouncing the liturgy of the majority of Western Christians as illegitimate. At the present time, it is more akin to a museum piece from the history of Western Christianity and what things might have looked like in the Orthodox Church had reunion taken place before 1964, but it cannot approach what union would look like if it happened tomorrow. The obvious retort is that there is much to be glad about not having kept apace with in the Western Church, most notably the recent controversies over the place of openly homosexual individuals in the hierarchy of the Episcopal and Lutheran Churches, as well as the ordination of women in those same two bodies several decades ago. Yet, correlation is not causation, and there is no evidence that the two strands are essentially linked to a common impulse. For that matter, advocacy for liturgical reform stretches back past Vatican II into the middle part of the nineteenth century.[3] Thus, in a very real way, Western Rite Orthodoxy remains Western, but only an idealized form of the pre-Vatican II West, and not the West as it actually is today or was historically.

The Future of Western Rite Scholarship

Before the present work, the majority of scholarly investigation into the Western Rite had been concerned primarily with consideration of the ordinary of the AWRV liturgy in the *SASB*, usually in comparison to the liturgies of the ECOF. Schnerlia and Abramtsov's histories were hopelessly out of date since both were printed before the

[3] See Chapter 4 above.

AWRV became a functional reality. Furthermore, it is at least important to mention should a recently published review of the most significant secondary literature on the Western rite.[4] In looking through the literature, we can see that most of what has been written to this point is primarily an argument between pro- and anti-Western rite factions as to the validity or desirability of Western rites in general and the orthodoxy of the *SASB* specifically in more recent works. But, the near exclusive emphasis on the eucharistic liturgy leaves one to the potential conclusion that there is nothing to the Western rite other than GRE and TIK, and that other Western liturgies are not worth studying or even fighting over. Even in instances where attempt have been made to broaden the discussion, and here I am thinking specifically of Smith's article, the attempt has only been feeble, exclusively negative with regards to the AWRV, and highly transitory. On the subject of liturgical studies, while I have criticized individuals such as Andersen who place what is, in my opinion, an unnecessary emphasis on *TOM* as the exclusive expression of Western rite liturgy within the AWRV, I can also say that critics like Woolfenden and Smith are mistaken in their exclusive reliance on the *SASB*; both documents must be taken in consideration together.

The present work rectifies the previously deficient state of scholarship in a number of ways. First, the rites themselves are actually studied for what they say, rather than simply described for the unaware, as if such a methodology produced results which were self-explanatory. While the problems noted in the eucharistic liturgies were limited only to a few salient points, such as the elevation or eucharistic bread types, it has gone beyond the scope of previous efforts, aided in no small part to the amount of space which could be dedicated to the subject. Secondly, the discussion is extended beyond the eucharistic liturgy and into the other liturgies of Western Rite Orthodoxy. Though this development is positive, it must simultaneously be recognized that there is still significant progress that could be made, especially on what are sometimes identified as 'para-liturgical' devotions.

Secondly, the historical section is as comprehensive as one is able to make it in the space that is available for a dissertation which primarily focuses on theology and liturgy. In some instances, it is difficult to expand on the work of Schneirla or Abramtsov

[4] Cf. J. Turner, 'The Road Thus Far', *SVTQ* 53.4 (2009) 477-505.

because their works are foundational to any comprehensive history of Western Rite Orthodoxy, but also because they provide information which does not exist in any extant form that is easily obtainable. By way of example, Abramtsov is the only source for information on the Polish Orthodox National Church that can be found. Furthermore, because of the passage of time, closing the gaps between the death of Alexander Turner and the start of the current century will be exceptionally difficult as many of the important figures during this period have already died. While Schneirla, due to his exceptionally long tenure as the AWRV's Vicar-General and his vast experience with Western Rite Orthodoxy, remains a valuable source for the history of the AWRV this is still not the same as having the personal account of the principal individuals involved or accurate files. Most of the documentation covering the ECOF is still in French and as a result leaves this aspect of Western rite history closed to many English speaking students of the Western rite. Even so, the ECOF has taken the lead in telling its own story, providing a number of monographs on the subject and these items will need to be included in any future comprehensive history of Western Rite Orthodoxy, and it would be encouraging for the AWRV to follow that example.

Third, the present work takes account of the practical problems that Western Rite Orthodoxy presents to Orthodox ecclesiology and to Orthodoxy's attempts at rapprochement with the Roman Catholic and other Protestant Churches as currently constituted in the AWRV. Here again, most previous studies which are critical of the Western rite are critical of the rite itself. Where I have chosen to be critical, I am critical not only of the liturgy, though the criticisms I express are very different from those of Stratman or Smith, but also of what Western Rite Orthodoxy can be said to represent: an uncritical adoption of the Western rite with and incomplete understanding of Orthodox ecclesiology and what makes the Western rite specifically Western. It is my assertion that most of the apologists for the Western rite have misplaced their emphases in a desperate attempt to avoid liturgical change while still 'remain' within an historic Church. This different critical perspective advances the study of the Western rite forward and points out that there is more implied by Western Rite Orthodoxy than just the celebration of a different ritual form.

Nevertheless, there is still significant room for growth in the study of the Western rite even beyond the current study. Some potential avenues of research involve expanding the scope of the present work, while others would mean going in an entirely different direction. The first area for further consideration would be the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy, and not simply the history of the Orthodox Church of France or the AWRV, no matter how important each of these might individually be. Rather, the recent emergence of the Western Rite has been placed in its proper historical context, both in terms of East-West relations more generally and the interplay between eastern and western liturgical customs more specifically. While there are a number of good, independent histories of eastern and western tensions, the liturgical tensions are often mentioned only in a passing manner. However, liturgy and liturgical customs are at the heart of the Western Rite and so deserve central attention in any consideration of the history of Western Rite Orthodoxy. More importantly, the history has been considered in a dispassionate manner, with no particular agenda pushed in regards to the rightness or truthfulness of the position of one side or the other, that is, Greek or Latin or Anglican. In this regard, the history in Chapters 2 and 3 are an attempt to grasp the facts and provide meaning rather than the more philosophical 'quest for truth' which often results in an attempt to press a polemical agenda and which has been characteristic of most Western rite histories written by 'armature' historians over the past half century; in that regard, regardless of how limited, the current work is a definite step forward. Still, there is significant work that can still be done, particularly in reconstructing the history of the various parishes that utilize the Western rite, even if one limits their focus exclusively to North America. There are a number of parishes that simply disappeared, some have changed to the Byzantine rite, and some have left the Antiochians or ROCOR for other quarter. Even among those parishes that can be identified as Western rite, a significant amount of detail as to their founding and history remains un-written. Simultaneously, the individual memoirs of AWRV pioneers, at least those who remain alive, should be committed to writing while such a task can still be undertaken.

Secondly, a deeper study of the liturgies of Western Rite Orthodoxy must be undertaken; it is not sufficient to continue to debate the Orthodoxy of the eucharistic rites in general form any longer. That is not to say that salient points cannot or should not be

treated in an in-depth manner, but that generalized discussions of GRE and TIK should not be favoured over the same treatment of other liturgies in the Western rite, such as the so-called 'para-liturgical' devotions, and the Western rite in the ROCOR. Furthermore, there is still a significant portion of work which could be done with the variable portions of the liturgy; this is particularly true for festal liturgies which not only have their own proper texts but have their own unique structures. The Triduum and the Paschal Vigil are the best example of these types of proper liturgies, and both have been mentioned in the present study though only briefly.

Third, it would be beneficial to move the study of the Western Rite liturgy away from exclusive focus on the AWRV and to include the liturgies of the French Church, the ROCOR, Holy Synod of Milan, and many of the more important autogenic Western rite churches. Some limited attempts have been made in this direction by Smyth, but his treatment leaves much to be desired in terms of systematic exposition. The course of this sort of study could take a variety of different directions, including direct textual comparisons or individualized treatment followed by extended critique of a Western rite on its own merits. There is certainly nothing limiting scholarly creativity at this point, and it is a substantial undertaking that would require an extensive commitment of time and resources depending on how far into the variable parts of the rite the individual wished to probe.

Finally, if the study of the Western rite is to be undertaken with any sort of seriousness by academics, access to available literature needs to be increased greatly. A comprehensive collection of texts related to Western Rite Orthodoxy within a single library with generous inter-library lending policies seems to be the most desirable solution. However, for this to work out, individuals in possession of documents and literature of value to the study of the movement would need to be donated to a single library as a part of a coordinated effort. It is unfortunate, but likely true, that no single library would be interested enough at this time to acquire the necessary works of its own initiative or out of its own funding. Here again, private individuals with an interest in promiting the study of Western Rite Orthodoxy would need to provide any partner library in question with donated books or targeted contributions. The question of which library would be most conducive to the program is one that needs to be considered. The libraries

of the Orthodox seminaries, specifically Holy Cross and St Vladimir's, are obvious choices. Less obvious are those institutions which already include significant portions of *The Basilian* and *Orthodoxy* in their collections who would be willing to circulate them through inter-library lending, as these journals are central to the history of the Western Rite in North America and new copies of which are unlikely to ever be found in private hands for donation.

The reception of new work on the Western rite demonstrates that there is a potential interest for further studies of this type, both within the Orthodoxy and within the broader scholarly community. Future progress will be dictated to some degree by availability and access to materials, but to a greater degree by individuals willing to commit significant time and energy towards the study of the matter. While this author is sufficiently interested to continue the necessary work based on the plans outlined already, there is enough potential work to sustain an entire career in academia. It would certainly be better if a larger number of individuals within the academic community, especially those from a Byzantine rite background, would make study of the subject matter, no matter how limited or brief.

APPENDIX 1
PARALLELS OF THE DIVINE LITURGY OF ST GREGORY

Below are parallel versions of the ordinary of the Divine Liturgy of St Gregory. The first column identifies the various parts of the liturgy by their common name (regular type) or the name of a specific prayer (italics). The second column is a reproduction of GRE as in *TOM*. The third column is GRE as given in the most recent edition of the *SASB*. The final column is the ordinary of the *Missale Romanum*. The English translation is taken from*The Catholic Missal* (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1934); the Latin text of the same volume was used for the present study, but has not been provided since there are no Latin versions of GRE.

The text of *TOR*, the *SASB* and *Missale Romanum* have been reproduced exactly, with the exception that the Last Gospel is only preserved in the incipit, since another Gospel can occasionally be appointed; the rubrics prayers provided for each liturgy have not been changed. All three texts have been formatted so that the introductory line of each prayer is consistent, thus allowing the reader to more easily see where prayers have been added or omitted; where prayers are present in one version but not another, there is a blank space to indicate this. Capitalisation, hypenation, spelling, grammar, and punctuation have been reproduced as they are in the texts, without consideration for any mistakes on the part of the editors.

This text was prepared by the author for the present study and have been included here so that persons unfamiliar with any or all of the texts would have a reference when reading that section.

	The Orthodox Missal	*Saint Andrews Service Book*	*Missale Romanum*
	On Sundays only, except during Eastertide	*On Sundays, the service may begin with the weekly reminder of our Baptism.*	*Arriving at the foot of the altar the priest intones the Antiphon. In Passion Time the* Glory, etc. *is omitted.*
Asperges	Thou shalt purge me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be clean: thou shalt wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.	Thou shalt purge me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be clean; Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.	Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed: thou shalt wash me and I shall be made whiter than snow.
	Have mercy upon me, O God: after thy great goodness.	Have mercy upon me, O God, after Thy great goodness.	Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy great mercy.
	P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son; and to the Holy Ghost; R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.	P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen. *The Gloria Patri is omitted on Passion Sunday and on Palm Sunday.*	P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son; and to the Holy Ghost; R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.
	Thou shalt purge me…	Thou shalt purge me…	*Ant.* Thou shalt sprinkle me…
	The Gloria Patri *is omitted on Passion Sunday and Palm Sunday.*		
	At Solemn Mass, the Introit is sung while the following prayers of preparation are said. Note that the Psalm is omitted in Requiem Masses, and during Passion-tide	*At Solemn Mass, a hymn may be sung while the preparation is said, and the altar is censed.*	
Prayers at the Foot of the Altar	P: ✠In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. R: Amen P: I will go unto the altar of God	P. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. R. Amen. P. I will go unto the altar of God.	P: In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. R: Amen P: I will go unto the altar of God

R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness.

P: Give sentence with me, O God, and defend my cause against the ungodly people: O deliver me from the deceitful and wicked man.
R: For thou art the God of my strength; why hast thou put me from thee: and why go I so heavily, while the enemy opresseth me?

P: O send out thy light and thy truth, that they may lead me and bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy dwelling.
R: And that I may go unto the altar of God, even unto the God of my joy and gladness and upon the harp will I give thanks unto thee, O God, my God.

P: Why art thou so heavy, O my soul and why art thou so disquieted within me.

R: O put thy trust in God for I will yet give him thanks, which is the help of my countenance, and my God.

P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost
R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen.

P: I will go unto the altar of God
R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness
P: Our help is in the Name of the Lord.

R. Even unto the God of my joy and gladness.

P. Give sentence with me O God, and defend my cause against the ungodly people: O deliver me from the deceitful and wicked man.
R. For Thou art the God of my strength: why hast Thou put me from Thee: and why go I so heavily while the enemy oppresseth me?

P. O send out Thy light and Thy truth that they may lead me: and bring me unto Thy holy hill and to Thy dwelling.
R. And that I may go unto the altar of God, even unto the God of my joy and gladness: and upon the harp will I give thanks unto Thee, O God, my God.

P. Why art thou so heavy, O my soul: and why art thou so disquieted within me?

R. O put thy trust in God, for I will yet give him thanks: which is the help of my countenance and my God.

P. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost
R. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

NOTE, the foregoing psalm is omitted in Requiem Masses, and from Passion Sunday to Easter.

P. I will go unto the altar of God.
R. Even unto the God of my joy and gladness.
P. Our help is in the ✠ Name of the Lord.

R: Unto God, who giveth joy to my youth.

P: Judge me, O God, and distinguish my cause from the nation not holy: deliver me from the unjust and deceitful man
R: For thou, O God, art my strength; why hast thou cast me off? And why go sorrowful while the enemy afflicteth me?

P: Send forth thy light and truth: They have conducted me, and brought me unto thy holy mount, and into thy tabernacles.
R: And I will go unto the altar of God; unto God who giveth joy to my youth.

P: To thee, O God, my God, I will give praise upon the harp: why art thou sad, my soul, and why dost thou disquiet me?
R: Hope in God, for I will still give praise to him: the salvation of my countenance and my God.

P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost
R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen.

P: I will go unto the altar of God
R: Unto God, who giveth joy to my youth.
P: Our help ✠ is in the Name of the Lord.

	R: Who hath made heaven and earth.	R. Who hath made heaven and earth.	R: Who hath made heaven and earth.
Confetior	P: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you brethren, to pray to the Lord our God for me.	P. I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you brethren: that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my fault, by my own fault, by my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, brethren, to pray for me to the Lord our God.	
Misereautr	R: Almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee thy sins, and bring thee to everlasting life. P: Amen	R. Almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life. P. Amen.	
			Following the priest's Confiteor *the minister now says for the people:*
	R: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and thee Father, to pray to the Lord our God for me.	R. I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you, Father: that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my fault, by my own fault, by my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, Father, to pray for me to the Lord our God.	R: I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to you, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beseech blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you Father, to pray to the Lord our God for me.

P: Almighty God have mercy upon *you*, forgive *you your* sins, and bring *you* to everlasting life.
R: Amen

P: ✠ The Almighty and merciful Lord grant us pardon, absolution, and remission of our sins.
R: Amen.

P: Wilt thou not turn again and quicken us, O God?
R: That thy people may rejoice in thee.
P: Shew us thy mercy, O Lord.
R: And grant us thy salvation.
P: Lord, hear my prayer.
R: And let my cry come unto thee.
P: The Lord be with you.
R: And with thy spirit.
P: Let us pray…

The priest ascends the altar saying:

P: Take away from us, we beseech thee, O Lord, all our iniquities, that we may enter the holy of holies with pure minds. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

And kissing the altar, he says:

We beseech thee, O Lord, by the prayers of thy Saints [whose relics are here], that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive us all our sins. Amen.

P. Almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life.
R. Amen.

P. May the Almighty and Merciful Lord grant us pardon, absolution ✠ and remission of all our sins.
R. Amen.

P. Turn us, again, O Lord, and quicken us.

R. That Thy people may rejoice in Thee.
P. O Lord, show Thy mercy upon us.
R. And grant us Thy salvation.
P. O Lord, hear my prayer.
R. And let my cry come unto Thee.
P. The Lord be with you.
R. And with thy spirit.
P. Let us pray.

The priest ascends to the altar, saying appropriate prayers, and reverencing it with a kiss.

P: May Almighty God have mercy upon you and forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life.
R: Amen

P: May the almighty and merciful Lord grant us pardon, ✠ absolution, and remission of our sins.
R: Amen.

P: Though shalt turn again, O God, and quicken us.
R: And thy people shall rejoice in thee.
P: Show us thy mercy, O Lord.
R: And grant us thy salvation.
P: O Lord, hear my prayer.
R: And let my cry come unto thee.
P: The Lord be with you.
R: And with thy spirit.
P: Let us pray…

Going up to the altar, the priest says inaudibly:

P: Take away from us our iniquities, we beseech thee, O Lord: that we may be worthy to enter with pure minds into the Holy of holies. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy saints whose relics are here, and of all the saints, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive me all my sins. Amen.

At High Mass incense is set with appropriate prayers, after which the altar and Priest are censed. But NOTE, that incense is not used during the Introit at Nuptial Masses or at Masses for the dead.

At high mass, the priest, before reading the Introit, bless in cense saying,

Be thou bles✠sed by him in whose honor thou shalt burn.

The celebrant then incenses the altar and is incensed by the Deacon

Introit

The appointed psalm verse is sung or read. At Solemn Mass, incense is blessed, and the altar and celebrant censed.

The Introit varies according to the feast.

Kyrie

Kyrie, eleison.
(Lord, have mercy upon us.)
Kyrie, eleison.
(Lord, have mercy upon us.)
Kyrie, eleison.
(Lord, have mercy upon us.)
Christe, eleison.
(Christ, have mercy upon us.)
Christe, eleison.
(Christ, have mercy upon us.)
Christe, eleison.
(Christ, have mercy upon us.)
Kyrie, eleison.
(Lord, have mercy upon us.)
Kyrie, eleison.
(Lord, have mercy upon us.)
Kyrie, eleison.
(Lord, have mercy upon us.)

Lord, Have mercy upon us.
(Kyrie, eleison)
Lord, Have mercy upon us.
(Kyrie, eleison)
Lord, Have mercy upon us.
(Kyrie, eleison)
Christ, Have mercy upon us.
(Christe, eleison)
Christ, Have mercy upon us.
(Christe, eleison)
Christ, Have mercy upon us.
(Christe, eleison)
Lord, Have mercy upon us.
(Kyrie, eleison)
Lord, Have mercy upon us.
(Kyrie, eleison)
Lord, Have mercy upon us.
(Kyrie, eleison)

P: Lord, have mercy.
R: Lord, have mercy.
P: Lord, have mercy.

R: Christ, have mercy.
P: Christ, have mercy.
R: Christ, have mercy.

P: Lord, have mercy.
R: Lord, have mercy.
P: Lord, have mercy.

	When appointed, the following hymn is sung or said, all standing, the priest first intoning	*The Gloria is omitted during Advent and Lent, and at Nuptial and Requiem Masses.*	*Afterwards, at the middle of the altar, the priest says the* Gloria in excelsis*. The* Gloria *is omitted in Masses of Advent and of the time between Septuagesima and Holy Thursday and in some weekday masses.*
Gloria	P: Glory be to God on high, R: And on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.	P. Glory be to God on high, R. And on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.	P: Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will. We praise thee; we bless thee; we adore thee; we glorify thee. We give thee thanks for thy great glory. O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father almighty.
	O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.	O Lord, the Only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.	O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us: Thou who takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer: Thou who sittest at the right had of the Father, have mercy upon us.
	For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only, O Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, ✠ art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.	For Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O (Jesus) Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the ✠ glory of God the Father. Amen.	For thou only art holy: Thou only art Lord: Thou only, O Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost ✠, are most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.
	The celebrant says to the people,		
Collect(s)	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.	P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit P. Let us pray.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.
	The Celebrant sings or says the Collect(s) and the people respond	*Then the priest shall read the appropriate Collect for the day, at the end of which is said* . . . world without end.	*The* Collect *is said according to the proper Mass.*

	R: Amen.	R. Amen.	
Epistle	*The people sit. The Epistle appointed is read and the people respond:*	*Then the Epistle appointed for the day is read, concluding with:*	*The Epistle varies according to the feast. At the termination is said:*
	R: Thanks be to God.	R. Thanks be to God.	R: Thanks be to God.
Gradual	*The Gradual and Alleluia sentences are sung by the Choir or read by the Celebrant. The Deacon or Priest who is to say or sing the Gospel then says*		*Here follows the* Gradual, Tract, *or* Alleluia *with verse or Sequence, according to the Season. At Solemn Mass, incense is blessed as before.*
Munda cor meum	P: Cleanse my heart and my lips, O almighty God, who didst cleanse the lips of the prophet Isaiah with a burning coal, and in thy gracious mercy so purify me that I may worthily proclaim thy holy Gospel. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.		P: Cleanse my heart and my lips, O almighty God, who didst cleanse the lips of the prophet Isaias with a burning coal; vouchsafe, through thy gracious mercy, so to purify me that I may worthily proclaim thy holy Gospel. Through Christ our Lord.
Jube, Domine	P: May the Lord be in my [thy] heart and on my [thy] lips, that I may [thou mayest] worthily attend to his holy Gospel. Amen.		P: Lord, grant thy blessing. The Lord be in my heart and on my lips, that I may worthily and fittingly proclaim his holy Gospel.
			In Solemn Mass the deacon asks, and the priest gives, the Blessing *before the* Gospel.
	At High Masses, incense is set with appropriate prayers and the Gospel is censed after the salutation.	*The priest prays to worthily proclaim the Gospel, incense is set, and the Book of the Gospels censed after the salutation.*	
Gospel	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: The ✠ continuation (beginning) of the Holy Gospel according to (*Name*).	P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. P. The continuation (beginning) of the Holy Gospel according to *(Name).*	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: The continuation (beginning) of the holy Gospel according to (*Name*).
	The People sign themselves on the forehead,	*The people, standing, sign themselves on the*	

	lips, and breast.	*forehead, lips and breast.*	
	R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.	R. Glory be to Thee, O Lord.	R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.
	After the Gospel, the People say,	*The Gospel is then read or sung, concluding with*	
	R: Praise be to thee, O Christ.	R. Praise be to Thee, O Christ.	R: Praise be to thee, O Christ.
			P: By the words of the gospel may our sins be blotted out.
Sermon	*The Sermon may follow here an announcements may be made*.	*Here, the Sermon may be delivered and announcements made. But NOTE, that the sermon may be delivered at another place, at the discretion of the priest.*	
	On Sunday sand other Major Feasts there follows, all standing,		*On Sundays and certain chief feasts the priest here recites the* Creed *at the middle of the altar:*
Creed	P: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;	P: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;	P: I believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.
	R: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who, for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven *(genuflect),* and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; *(rise)* and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried; and	R: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of His Father before all worlds; God of God; Light of Light; Very God of Very God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made. Who, for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven *(kneel),* and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; *(rise)* And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered and was buried; and the	And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven [*here all kneel*] and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; and was made man. He was crucified also for us, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and was buried. The third day he rose

	the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.	third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures; And ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; Whose kingdom shall have no end.	again according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end.
	And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father; who, with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the Prophets. And I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. and I look for the resurrection of the dead, ✠ and the Life of the world to come. Amen.	And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father; who, with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the Prophets; And I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the Resurrection of the dead, ✠ and the Life of the world to come. Amen.	And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son: who together with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified; who spoke by the prophets. And one, holy, catholic and apostolic church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead ✠ and the life of the world to come. Amen.
		NOTE, the Creed is said on all Sundays and Greater Feasts, but is omitted at Nuptial and Requiem Masses.	
			The offertory is taken from the Mass of the day.
Offertory	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.	P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. P. Let us pray.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.
	The Offertory verse is sung by the Choir or said by the Celebrant. A hymn or anthem may be sung; a collection may be taken. As the priest prepares and offers bread and wine, he says the following prayers:	*The appropriate verse is said or sung. A hymn may be sung while the priest prepares the Offering of bread and wine with the appropriate prayers. At Solemn Mass incense is set, and the Offering, Altar, celebrant, and people are censed. This done, the priest turns to the people and bids them to share in the offering.*	*Elevating the bread on the paten, the priest says*:

Suspice, sancte Pater

P: Accept, O holy Father, almighty and everlasting God, this unspotted host which I, unworthy servant, offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences and negligences, as also for those here present and for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may avail me and them unto live everlasting. Amen.

P: Accept, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God, this stainless host, which I, thine unworthy servant, offer unto thee, my God, living and true, for mine own innumerable sins, offenses, and negligences, and for all here present; as also for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may be profitable for my own and for their salvation unto life eternal. Amen.

Making the a cross with the paten, he puts the host on the corporal. He then pours wine and the sudeacon water into the chalice, saying:

Deus,qui humanae substantiae

O God, who in creating human nature has wonderfully dignified it and still more wonderfully reformed it, grant that by the mystery of this water and wine, we may become partakers of his divine nature who deigned to partake of our human nature, thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God; throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

O God, who hast wonderfully formed man's exalted nature, and still more wonderfully restored it: grant us, by the mystic signification of this commingling of water and wine, to become partakers of his Godhead who vouchsafed to become partaker of our manhood, Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord; who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen.

Raising the chalice, the priest says:

Offerimus tibi

We offer unto thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching thy mercy, that it may ascend before thy divine majesty as a sweet odour for our salvation and for that of the whole world. Amen.

We offer unto thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching thy clemency that, in the sight of thy divine majesty, it may ascend with the odor of sweetness, for our salvation, and for that of the whole world. Amen.

In spiritu humilitatis

Accept us, O Lord, in the spirit of humility and contrition of heart: and grant that the sacrifice

In a humble spirit and a contrite heart may we be received by thee, O Lord; and let our

we offer this day in thy sight may be pleasing to thee, O Lord God.

Veni, sanctificator Come, O almighty and eternal Good the Sanctifier, bless this sacrifice prepared for the glory of thy holy Name.

At High Mass, incense is set with the following prayers:

Per intercessionem Through the intercession of Blessed Michael the Archangel standing at the right hand of the altar of incense, and of all his elect, may the Lord vouchsafe to bl✠ess this incense and receive it for a sweet smelling savour. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Oblations, altar, Priest, servers, and people are censed while the Priest says:

Incensum istud May this incense, which thou hast blest, ascend unto thee, O Lord: And may thy mercy descend upon us.

Dirigatur, Domine Let my prayer, O Lord, be set forth in thy sight as the incense: and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice. Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth, and keep the door of my lips: O let not mine heart be inclined to any evil thing, let me not be occupied in ungodly works.

As the Priest gives up the thurible, he says:

sacrifice be so made in thy sight that it please thee, O Lord God.

Come, O Sanctifier, almighty, eternal God, and bless ✠ this sacrifice set forth to thy holy name.

At Solemn Mass, the priest blesses the incense, saying:

By the intercession of the blessed Michael the Archangel, standing at the right hand of the altar of incense, and of all his elect, may the Lord vouchsafe to bless ✠ this incense and receive it as an odor of sweetness. Through Christ our Lord.

The Priest censes the oblation and the altar, saying:

Let this incense which thou hast blessed, rise before thee, O Lord, and may thy mercy descend upon us.

While incensing the altar, the priest says:

Let my prayer, O Lord, be set forth as incense in thy sight; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice. Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth, and a door round about my lips; lest my heart incline to evil words, to seek excuses in sin.

The Priest returns the censer to the deacon, saying

Accendat in nobis The Lord kindle in us the fire of his love, and the flame of eternal charity. Amen.

The priest now washes his hands, saying

Lavabo I will was my hands in innocency, O Lord, and so will I go to thine altar. That I may show the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wonderous works. Lord, I have loved the habitation of thine house, and the place where thine honour dwelleth. O shut not up my soul with the sinners, nor my life with the bloodthirsty: in whose hands is wickedness, and their right hand is full of gifts. But as for me, I will walk innocently: O deliver me and be merciful to me. My foot standeth right, I will praise the Lord in the congregations. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Suscipe, sancta Trinitas Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to thee in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honour of blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, of blessed John (the) Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all Saints; that it may be available to their honour and our salvation: and that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth. Through the same Christ

May the Lord enkindle in us the fire of his love, and the flame of everlasting charity. Amen.

Here the celebrant is incensed by the deacon, who next incenses the clergy present. Washing his hands, the priest says:

I will wash my hands among the innocent; and I will compass thine altar, O Lord. That I may hear the voice of praise, and tell of all thy wondrous works. O Lord, I have loved the beauty of thy house, and the place where thy glory dwelleth. Take not away my soul, O God, with the wicked, nor my life with men of blood. In whose hands are iniquities: their right hand is filled with gifts. But as for me I have walked in my innocence: redeem me, and be merciful to me. My foot hath stood in the right way: in the churches I will bless thee, O Lord. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer unto thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honor of blessed Mary, ever Virgin, of blessed John the Baptist, of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, of these, and of all thy saints: that it may be to their honor and our salvation; and may they vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth. Through the same Christ our Lord.

	our Lord. Amen.		
	The Celebrant continues,		
Orate, fratres	P: Pray, brethren, that this my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty. R: May the Lord receive this sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of his Name, both to our benefit and that of all his holy Church.	P. Brethren, pray that this my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty. R. May the Lord receive this sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of His Name, both to our benefit, and that of all His holy Church.	P: Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father almighty. R: May the Lord receive the sacrifice from thy hands, to the praise and glory of his name, to our benefit and to that of all his holy church. P: Amen.
Secret	*Then he adds the Secret prayer(s).*	*The priest says the* Secret *prayers proper to the day. He concludes,* . . . throughout ages of ages. R. Amen.	*The priest says aloud the concluding words of the final secret prayer:* . . . world without end. R: Amen.
Canon	*The Celebrant sings or says*		
	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit.	P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit.
Sursum Corda	P: Lift up your hearts. R: We lift them up unto the Lord. P: Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. R: It is meet and right so to do. P: It is very meet, right, just and availing unto salvation, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty and everlasting God.	P. Lift up your hearts. R. We lift them up unto the Lord. P. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God. R. It is meet and right so to do. P. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, everlasting God.	P: Lift up your hearts. R: We have lifted them up unto the Lord. P: Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God. R: It is worthy and just. P: It is truly meet and just, right and availing unto salvation, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks to thee, O Holy Lord, Father almighty, everlasting God;
	Here a Proper Preface is sung or said as appointed.	*Here shall follow the proper preface, if there be one, followed by:*	*The preface is said according to the Mass.*
	Through Christ our Lord, by whom the angels praise thy majesty, the Dominions adore thee,	Through Christ, our Lord, by whom the angels praise Thy majesty, the Dominions adore	

Proper Preface	the Powers tremble, the Heavens and heavenly Host and the blessed Seraphim join with one glad voice in extolling thee. To their voices we pray thee, let our be added, while we say with humble praise:	Thee, the Powers tremble, the Heavens and the heavenly Host and the blessed Seraphim join with one glad voice in extolling Thee. To their voices we pray Thee, let ours be added, while we say with humble praise:	
Sanctus *Benedictus*	Holy, Holy Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. Blessed ✠ is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.	Holy, Holy Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. Blessed ✠ is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. Hosannah in the highest.	Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. ✠ Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.
Te igitur	P: Therefore Thee through Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord, that Thou wouldst be pleased to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy, spotless sacrifices, which we offer thee in the first place for thy holy Catholic Church, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to keep her in peace under thy protection, to bring her to unity and to guide her throughout the world: likewise for *(Name)* our Patriarch, for *(Name)* our Metropolitan, for the Holy Synod of Antioch, for the President of these United States, and for all Orthodox believers who hold the Catholic and apostolic faith.	P: Therefore Thee through Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord, that Thou wouldst be pleased to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy, spotless sacrifices, which we offer Thee in the first place for Thy holy Catholic Church, that Thou wouldst vouchsafe to keep her in peace under Thy protection, to bring her to unity and to guide her throughout the world: likewise for *(Name)* our Patriarch, for *(Name)* our Metropolitan, for the Holy Synod of Antioch, for the head of our State, and for all Orthodox believers who hold the Catholic and apostolic faith.	P: We, therefore, humbly pray and beseech thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ, thy Son our Lord, that thou wouldst and bless these ✠ gifts and these ✠ presents, these ✠ holy unspotted sacrifices, which in the first place we offer thee for thy holy Catholic Church: which vouchsafe to pacify, guard, unite and govern throughout the whole world, together with thy servant *N.*, our pope, and *N.*, our Bishop; as also all orthodox believers and professors of the Catholic and Apostolic faith.
Memento	Remember, O Lord, thy servants and all here present whose faith and devotion are known unto thee, for whom we offer, or who offer to thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and those belonging to them, for the salvation of their souls, for their health and welfare, and who pay their vows to thee, the eternal, living and true God.	Remember, O Lord, Thy servants and all here present whose faith and devotion are known unto Thee, for whom we offer, or who offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and those belonging to them, for the salvation of their souls, for their health and welfare, and who pay their vows to Thee, the eternal, living and true God.	Be mindful, O Lord, of thy servants and handmaids, *N.* and *N.* And all here present whose faith and devotion are known to thee; for whom we offer, or who offer up to thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and all pertaining to them, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and wellbeing, and who pay their vows unto thee, the eternal, living, and true God.

	Here specific intentions may be made.	*(Here specific intentions may be made.)*	
Communicantes	In communion with, and venerating first the memory of the glorious and ever-virgin Mary, Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ; and also of thy blessed Apostles and Martyrs *(here individual saints may be named)* and of all thy Saints, through whose prayers grant that in all things we may be guarded by the help of thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.	In communion with, and venerating first the memory of the glorious and Ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ; and also of Thy blessed Apostles and Martyrs *(here individual saints may be named)* and of all Thy Saints, through whose prayers grant that in all things we may be guarded by the help of Thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.	We pray in union with and honor the memory, especially of the glorious ever Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ; as also of thy apostles and martyers, Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Thaddaeus; of Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian: and of all thy saints; by whose merits and prayers grant that we may in all things be defended by the aid of thy protection. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.
Hanc igitur	We therefore pray thee, O Lord, mercifully to accept this offering of our service and that of all thy family; to order our days in thy peace, to deliver us from eternal damnation, and to number us in the flock of thine elect. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.	We therefore pray Thee, O Lord, mercifully to accept this offering of our service and that of all Thy family; to order our days in Thy peace, to deliver us from eternal damnation, and to number us in the flock of Thine elect. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.	This oblation, therefore, of our service and that of thy whole family, we beseech thee, O Lord, graciously to accept; and to dispose our days in thy peace, and to command us to be delivered from eternal damnation and to be numberd in the flock of thine elect. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.
Quam oblationem	Which offering, we beseech thee, O God, to bless, consecrate, approve, make worthy and acceptable in every way, that it may become for us the Body and Blood of thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.	Which offering, we beseech Thee, O God, to bless, consecrate, approve, make worthy and acceptable in every way, that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.	Which oblation, do thou, O God, we beseech thee, vouchsafe to make in all things ✠ blessed, ✠ approved, ✠ ratified, reasonable and acceptable: that it may become for us the Body ✠ and Blood ✠ of thy dearly beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.
Verba (Qui pridie)	Who, the day before he suffered, took bread into his holy and venerable hands and, with his eyes lifted up to heaven unto thee, God his almighty Father, giving thanks unto thee, he blessed, brake and gave it to his disciples,	Who, the day before He suffered, took bread into His holy and venerable hands and, with His eyes lifted up to heaven unto Thee, God His Almighty Father, giving thanks unto Thee, He blessed, brake and gave it to His disciples,	Who, the day before he suffered, took bread into his holy and venerable hands, and with his eyes lifted up towards heaven unto thee, O God, his almighty Father, giving thanks to thee, he did bless, ✠ brake, and gave to his

	saying: Take and eat ye all of this, for this is my Body.	saying: Take and eat ye all of this, for This is my Body.	disciples, saying: Take and eat ye all of this, FOR THIS IS MY BODY
	The bell rings thrice for the elevation of the Host.		
(Simili modo)	In like manner after he had supped, taking also this excellent chalice into his holy and venerable hands, again giving thanks unto thee, he blessed it, and gave it to his disciples saying: Take and drink ye all of this, for this is the cup of my Blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins. As oft as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of me.	In like manner after He had supped, taking also this excellent chalice into His holy and venerable hands, again giving thanks unto Thee, He blessed it, and gave it to His disciples saying: Take and drink ye all of this, for This is the cup of my Blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins. As oft as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me.	In like manner, after supper, taking also this excellent chalice into his holy and venerable hands; and giving thanks to thee, he ✠ blessed and gave it to his disciples, saying: All of you take and drink this. FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF FAITH; WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY, FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS. As often as you shall do these things, you shall do them in memory of me.
	The bell rings thrice for the elevation of the Chalice.		
Unde et memores	Wherefore, O Lord, we thy servants, as also thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion of the same Christ, thy Son our Lord, his Resurrection from the dead and glorious Ascension into heaven, offer unto thy most excellent majesty of thy gifts bestowed upon us a pure host, a holy host, a spotless host, the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation.	Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, as also Thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion of the same Christ, Thy Son our Lord, His Resurrection from the dead and glorious Ascension into heaven, offer unto Thy most excellent Majesty of Thy gifts bestowed upon us a pure host, a holy host, a spotless host, the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation.	Wherefore, O Lord, we thy servants, and likewise thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ, thy Son, our Lord, together with his resurrection from the grave, and his glorious ascension into heaven, offer unto thy excellent majesty, of thy gifts and presents, a pure ✠ victim, a holy ✠ victim, an immaculate ✠ victim, the holy ✠ bread of life eternal and the chalice ✠ of everlasting salvation.
Supra quae propitio	Upon which vouchsafe to look with a favorable and serene countenance, and to accept them as thou wert graciously pleased to	Upon which vouchsafe to look with a favorable and serene countenance, and to accept them as Thou wert graciously pleased	Upon which do thou vouchsafe to look with favorable and gracious countenance and accept them, as thou didst vouchsafe to accept the

	accept the gifts of thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which thy high priest Melchisedech offered unto thee, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.	to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchisedech offered unto Thee, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.	gifts of thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that why thy high priest Melchisedech offered unto thee, a holy sacrifice, an unspotted victim..
Epiclesis	And we beseech thee, O Lord, to send down thy Holy Spirit upon these offerings, that he would make this pread the precious Body of thy Christ, and that which is in this Cup the precious blood of thy Son our lord Jesus Christ, transmuting them by thy Holy Spirit.	And we beseech Thee, O Lord to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon these offerings, that He would make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in this Cup the precious Blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, transmuting them by Thy Holy Spirit.	
	R: Amen. Amen. Amen.	R. Amen. Amen. Amen.	
	The bell is rung thrice.		
Supplices te rogamus	P: We humbly beseech thee, almighty Good, to command that these things be borne by the hands of thy holy angel to thine altar on high, into the presence of thy divine majesty, that so many of us as shall partake at this altar of the most sacred Body and Blood of thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.	P: We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, to command that these things be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thine altar on high, into the presence of Thy divine Majesty, that so many of us as shall partake at this altar of the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction. Through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.	We most humbly beseech thee, almighty God, command these to be carried by the hands of thy holy angel to thine altar on high, in the presence of thy divine majesty, that as many of us as shall, by partaking at this altar, receive the most sacred ✠ Body and ✠ Blood of thy Son may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.
Momento etiam	Be mindful also, O Lord, of thy servants who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and who rest in the sleep of peace. (*Here the departed are commemorated*). To them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant we pray thee a place of refreshment, light and peace, through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.	Be mindful also, O Lord, of Thy servants who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and who rest in the sleep of peace. *(here the departed are commemorated)* To them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant we pray Thee a place of refreshment, light and peace, through the same Christ, our Lord. Amen.	Be mindful, O Lord, of thy servants and handmaids, *N.* and *N.*, who have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep the sleep of peace. To these, O Lord, and to all that rest in Christ, we beseech thee to grant a place of refreshment, of light and of peace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Nobis quoque peccatoribus	To us sinners also, thy servants, confiding in the multitude of thy mercies, grant some lot and partnership with thy holy apostles and martyrs (*here individual saints may be named*) and with all thy saints, into whose company we pray thee of thy mercy to admit us, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences. Through Christ our Lord, by whom O Lord, thou dost ever create, sanctify, quicken, bless, and bestow upon us all these good things.	To us sinners also, Thy servants, confiding in the multitude of Thy mercies, grant some lot and partnership with Thy holy apostles and martyrs *(Here individual saints may be named.)* and with all Thy saints, into whose company we pray Thee of Thy mercy to admit us, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences. Through Christ, our Lord, by whom O Lord, Thou dost ever create, sanctify, quicken, bless and bestow upon us all these good things.	To us also, thy sinful servants, who hope in the multitude of thy mercies, vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with thy holy Apostles and Martyrs; with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecily, Anastasia, and all thy saints: into whose company, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offenses, we beseech thee to admit us. Through Christ our Lord.By whom, O Lord, thou dost create, ✠ hallow, ✠quicken, and ✠ bless these thine ever-bountiful gifts and give them to us.
Per quem haec omnia	For by him, and with him, and in him is to thee, God the Father almighty, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honor and glory, throughout all ages of ages.	For by him, and with him, and in him is to Thee, God the Father Almighty, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honor and glory, throughout all ages of ages.	Through ✠ him, and with ✠ him, and in ✠ him, is to thee, God the Father ✠ almighty, in the unity of the Holy ✠ Ghost all honor and glory, forever and ever.
	R: Amen.	R: Amen.	R: Amen.
	P: Let us pray. Instructed by saving precepts and following thy divine institution, we presume to say:	P: Let us pray. Instructed by saving precepts and following Thy divine institution, we presume to say:	P: Admonished by thy saving precepts, and following thy divine institution, we make bold to say:
Pater Noster	R: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation,	R: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation,	P: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name: Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread: and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation.
	but deliver us from evil.	but deliver us from evil. (For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.) Amen.	R: But deliver us from evil.

	The priest continues:	*The priest now says the prayer for the* Fracture*, or breaking of the bread, and exchanges the* Pax*, or Peace, with the congregation.*	
Libera nos	P: Deliver us, we beseech thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come; and at the intercession of the blessed and glorious Mary, Ever-Virgin Mother of God, of thy blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, Andrew, and all thy Saints, graciously give peace in our time, that aided by the help of thy loving kindness, we may both be both ever free from sin and secure from all disquietude. Through the same Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, ever one God.		P: Deliver us, we beseech thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present and to come: and by the intersession of blessed and glorious Mary ever Virgin, Mother of God, together with thy blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and Andrew, and all the Saints, graciously give peace in our days: that, aided by the help of thy mercy, we may be always free from sin, and secure from all disturbance. Through the same Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost.
Fracture	*The Celebrant breaks the consecrated bread and then sings or says*		*Taking the sacred Host, the priest breaks it in half, saying:*
	P: World without end. R: Amen.	P. . . .throughout all ages of ages. R: Amen.	P: World without end. R: Amen.
	P: The peace of the Lord be always with you. R: And with thy spirit.	P. The peace of the Lord be always with you. R. And with thy spirit.	P: May the peace ✠ of the Lord be ✠ always with ✠ you. R: And with thy spirit.
			P: May this mingling and hallowing of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ avail us that receive it unto life everlasting. Amen.
Agnus Dei	*The following is then sung or said,*		
	O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of	O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of	P: Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of

	the world: have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world: have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world: grant us thy peace.	the world: have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world: have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world: grant us Thy peace.	the world: have mercy upon us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world: have mercy upon us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world: grant us peace.
	In Masses for the Dead, in place of "have mercy upon us" *is said,* "grant them rest"*, and in place of* "grant us thy peace"*, is said:* "grant them rest eternal".	*At Requiem Masses, instead of* "Have mercy upon us"*, the following is said or sung:* "Grant them rest, grant them rest, grant them rest eternal."	
Communion	*The following prayer is said, except in Masses for the Dead*		
Pax	P: O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to thine Apostles, peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, regard not our sins, but the faith of thy Church; and grant her that peace and unity which are agreeable to thy will. Who livest and reignest for ever and ever. Amen.		P: O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to thy Apostles, Pease I leave you, my peace I give you: look not upon my sins but upon the faith of thy Church; and vouchsafe to her that peace and union which are agreable to thy will: who livest and reignest God world without end. Amen. *At Solemn Mass, the priest kisses the altar, and the kiss of peace is then given to him by the deacon, who in turn gives it to the other clergy present:* P: Peace be with thee. R: And with thy spirit.
	The Priest continues:	*The priest then says the following pre-communion prayers, which the people may also say.*	*The kiss of peace is omitted in masses for the dead.*
	P: O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who by the will of the Father and the	P: O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who by the will of the Father and the	P: O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who, according to the will of thy Father,

cooperation of the Holy Ghost has, by thy death, given life to the world, deliver me, I beseech thee, by this most holy Body and Blood, from all iniquities and from every evil. Make me ever obedient to thy commandments, and suffer me not to be ever separated from thee, who livest and reignest with God the Father, in the unity of the same Spirit, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

Let not the participation of thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I a albeit unworthy, receive, be to me for judgment and condemnation; but by thy goodness may it be a safeguard and remedy both to soul and body, who with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, livest and reignest, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

At the Priest's Communion, he says:

P: I will take the bread of heaven and call upon the Name of the Lord. (*Then thrice*) Lord, I am not worthy: that thou shouldest enter under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed.

The bell is rung thrice.

As the Priest receives the Body, he says:

P: May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

cooperation of the Holy Spirit hast, by Thy death, given life to the world, deliver me, I beseech Thee, by this Thy most holy Body and Blood, from all iniquities and from every evil. Make me ever obedient to Thy commandments, and suffer me not to be for ever separated from Thee, who livest and reignest with God the Father, in the unity of the same Spirit, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

Let not the participation of Thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I albeit unworthy, receive, be to me for judgment and condemnation; but by Thy goodness may it be a safeguard and remedy both to soul and body, who with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, livest and reignest, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

The priest makes his own Communion.

The bells may ring three times signaling the people to come forward for Communion.

through the coöperation of the Holy Ghost, hast by death given life to the world; deliver me by this thy most holy Body and Blood from all my transgression and from all evils; and make me ever cling to thy commandments, and never suffer me to be separated from thee; who with the same God the Father and the Holy Ghost, livest, etc. Amen.

Let not the partaking of thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I, though unworthy, presume to receive, turn to my judgment and condemnation; but by thy mercy may it be profitable to the safety and health both of soul and body. Who with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest God world without end Amen.

The priest takes communion, saying:

P: I will take the bread of heaven and will call upon the name of the Lord. Lord, I am not worthy that thou should enter under my roof; say but the world and my soul shall be healed.

P: May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto life everlasting. Amen.

After which he says:

P: What reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that he hath done unto me? I will receive the cup of salvation and call upon the Name of the Lord. I will call upon the Lord, which is worthy to be praised, so shall I be safe from mine enemies.

He then receives the Precious Blood, saying:

P: May the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

Facing the people, the Celebrant says the following Invitation:

P: ✠ Behold the Lamb of God; behold him that takest away the sins of the world

The Celebrant and the People respond three times,

R: Lord, I am not worth that thou shouldst enter under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed.

The people say this prayer of preparation before receiving the Sacrament;

I believe, O Lord, and I confess that thou art truly the Christ, the Son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of

What return shall I make to the Lord for all he has given me? I will take the chalice of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord. Praising, I will call upon the Lord, and shall be saved from my enemies.

The drinks from the chalice, saying:

P: May the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ keep my soul unto life everlasting. Amen.

If there are any communicants, the priest should give them communion before purifying the vessels.

Turning to the faithful, the priest says:

P. Behold the Lamb of God; behold him that takest away the sins of the world.

Then, three times:

P. Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldest enter under my roof.
R. But only say the word and my soul shall be healed.

Then shall the priest and people say together the following prayer in preparation to receive Holy Communion.

I believe, O Lord, and I confess that Thou art truly the Christ, the son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of

	whom I am chief. And I believe that this is truly thine own immaculate Body, and that this is truly thine own precious Blood. Wherefore I pray thee, have mercy upon me and forgive my transgressions both voluntary and involuntary, of word and of deed, of knowledge and of ignorance; make me worthy to partake without condemnation of thine immaculate Mysteries, unto remission of my sins and unto life everlasting. Amen. [Of thy Mystic Supper, O Son of God, accept me today as a communicant: For I will not speak of thy Mystery to thine enemies, neither will I give thee a kiss as did Judas; but like the thief I will confess thee: Remember me, O Lord, in thy Kingdom. Not unto judgment no unto condemnation be my partaking of thy Holy Mysteries, O Lord, but unto the healing of soul and body.]	whom I am chief. And I believe that this is truly Thine own immaculate Body, and that this is truly Thine own precious Blood. Wherefore I pray Thee, have mercy upon me and forgive my transgressions, both voluntary and involuntary, of word and of deed, of knowledge and of ignorance; and make me worthy to partake without condemnation of thine immaculate Mysteries, unto remission of my sins and unto life everlasting. Amen.	
	The Body and Blood of Christ are administered together with these words:	*The priest and assisting clergy communicate the people with the following words:*	
	P: May the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.	P. May the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life.	
	During the ministration of Communion, hymns, Psalms, or anthems may be sung.		
Postcommunion	*At the ablutions, the Priest says:*	*After communion, the priest performs the Ablutions, cleansing the sacred vessels.*	*The server pours a little wine into the chalice, and the priest takes the first ablution, saying*:
	P: What we have partaken with our mouth, O Lord, may we receive with a pure heart, and of a temporal gift, may it become to us an eternal remedy.		P: What we have taken with our mouth, O Lord, may we receive with a pure hear; and from a temporal gift may it become to us an everlasting healing.

			Here the server pours wine and water over the priest's fingers at the Epistle side of the altar, and the priest says:
	May thy Body and Blood which I have received, cleave unto my heart, O Lord; and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, having been fed with this pure and holy Sacrament. Who livest and reignest in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.		May thy Body, O Lord, which I have received, and thy Blood which I have drunk, cleave unto my inmost parts; and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, who have been refreshed with pure and holy mysteries. Who liveth and reigneth for ever and ever. Amen
	The proper Communion sentence is then said or sung. Then the priest, turning to the people says, P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. P. Let us pray. . .	*The proper Communion verse is read or sung. Then all stand for the post-communion prayer.* P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. P. Let us pray. . . throughout all ages of ages. *Amen*.	*The post communion is said according to the Mass :*
	The Celebrant then says the Postcommunion Collect(s).		
	The Deacon, or the Celebrant, dismisses the people with these words.		*The Mass ends with the* Dismissal, Blessing *and* Last Gospel.
Dismissal	P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. *Then , if it is a day upon which the Gloria has been said, he turns to the people and says:* P: Ite missa est. R: Deo Gratias.	P. The Lord be with you. R. And with thy spirit. P. Ite missa est. R. Deo Gratias.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Go, the mass is finished. R: Thanks be to God.

*From the Easter Vigil through Low Saturday "*Alleluia, Alleluia*" is added to the dismissal and response.*

At other times is said,

P: Let us bless the Lord.
R: Thanks be to God.

Or, at a Requiem,

P: May they rest in peace.
R: Amen.

Then the Priest says:

P: Let the obedient performance of my bounden duty be pleasing unto thee, O Holy Trinity; and grant that this sacrifice which I, unworthy that I am, have offered in the sight of thy majesty, may be acceptable unto thee and may through thy mercy, obtain thy favour for myself and for all those in whose behalf I have offered it. Who livest and reignest, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

The Bishop when present, or the Priest, gives the bless; but NOTE that the blessing is not give at a Requiem.

Blessing

P: The blessing of God Almighty, the ✠ Father, the Son, and the Holy Spriti descend upon you, and remain with you always.
R: Amen.

In penitential seasons, may be said:

P. Let us bless the Lord
R. Thanks be to God.

At Requiem Masses is said:

P. May they rest in peace.
R. Amen.

Then the priest says the final prayer, and turns to the people, and says:

P: The blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, ✠ and the Holy Spirit, descend upon you, and remain with you always.
R: Amen.

Or, according to what mass is being said:

P: Let us bless the Lord.
R: Thanks be to God.

At mass for the dead, he says:

P: May they rest in peace.
R: Amen.

Bowing at the middle of the altar, the priest says:

P: May the performance of my homage be pleasing to the, O holy Trinity; and grant that the sacrifice which I, though unworthy, have offered up in the sight of thy majesty, may be acceptable unto thee, and may, through thy mercy, be a propitiation for myself, and all those for whom I have offered it. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

P: May God almighty bless you, Father, and Son ✠, and Holy Ghost.
R: Amen.

Last Gospel

The people stand and the priest says,

P: The Lord be with you.
R: And with thy Spirit.
P: ✠ The Beginning of the Holy Gospel according to John.

Or if another Gospel is to be read, he says:
The Continuation of the Holy Gospel according to (*Name*).

R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.
P: In the beginning…full of grace and truth.
R: Thanks be to God.

Then may be read the Prologue to John's Gospel, all standing:

P. The Lord be with you.
R. And with thy spirit.
P. The beginning of the Holy Gospel according to St. John.

R. Glory be to Thee, O Lord.
P: In the beginning…full of grace and truth.
R: Thanks be to God.

The people stand and the priest says:

P: The Lord be with you.
R: And with thy Spirit.
P: ✠ The Beginning of the Holy Gospel according to John.

When a feast falls on a Sunday, or other day which has a proper Gospel *of its own, the* Gospel *of the day is read instead of* the Gospel of St John

R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.
P: In the beginning…full of grace and truth.
R: Thanks be to God.

APPENDIX 2
PARALLELS OF THE DIVINE LITURGY OF ST TIKHON

Below are parallel versions of the ordinary of the Divine Liturgy of St Tikhon. The first column identifies the various parts of the liturgy by their common name (regular type) or the name of a specific prayer (italics). The second column is a reproduction of TIK as in *TOM*. The third column is TIK as given in the most recent edition of the *SASB*. The final column is the ordinary of the *The Anglican Missal in the American Edition* (New York: Frank Gavin Liturgical Foundation, 1949).

The text of *TOR*, the *SASB* and *The Anglican Missal* have been reproduced exactly, with the exception that the Last Gospel is only preserved in the incipit, since another Gospel can occasionally be appointed; the rubrics prayers provided for each liturgy have not been changed. All three texts have been formatted so that the introductory line of each prayer is consistent, thus allowing the reader to more easily see where prayers have been added or omitted; where prayers are present in one version but not another, there is a blank space to indicate this. Capitalisation, hypenation, spelling, grammar, and punctuation have been reproduced as they are in the texts, without consideration for any mistakes on the part of the editors.

This text was prepared by the author for the present study and have been included here so that persons unfamiliar with any or all of the texts would have a reference when reading that section.

	The Orthodox Missal	Saint Andrew's Service Book	The Anglican Missal, 1947
Asperges	*On Sundays only, except during Eastertide*	*During Advent and Lent, the Liturgy may begin with the Litany.* *On Sundays and other special Feast days, the liturgy may continue with:*	*Having blessed the water, the Priest who is going to celebrate, vested in a Cope of the colour of the Office, proceeds to the Altar. And there, kneeling with the ministers at the steps, even in Eastertide, he receives the aspersory from the Deacon, and then first aspers the Altar thrice, then himself, and, standing up, the Ministers, beginning the Antiphon:*
	Thou shalt purge me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be clean: thou shalt wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. Have mercy upon me, O God: after thy great goodness. P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son; and to the Holy Ghost; R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen. Thou shalt purge me… *The* Gloria Patri *is omitted on Passion Sunday and Palm Sunday.* *At Solemn Mass, a hymn may be sung while the following prayers of preparation are said. Note that the Psalm is omitted in Requiem Masses, and during Passion-tide.*	Thou shalt purge me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be clean: thou shalt wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. Have mercy upon me, O God, after thy great mercy. P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen. Thou shalt purge me… *The* Gloria Patri *is omitted on Passion Sunday and Palm Sunday.* *At Solemn Liturgy, incense is set, after which the altar and priest are censed. The priest, standing at the altar, may begin the following preparations:*	Thou shalt purge me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be clean: Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Have mercy upon me, O God, after thy great goodness. P: Glory to the Father, and to the Son; and to the Holy Ghost; R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen Thou shalt purge me… *The* Gloria Patri *is omitted on Passion Sunday and Palm Sunday.*
Prayers at the Foot of the Altar	P: In the Name of the Father, ✠ and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. R: Amen P: I will go unto the altar of God	P: In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. R: Amen P: I will go unto the altar of God	P: In the Name of the Father, ✠ and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. R: Amen P: I will go unto the altar of God

R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness

P: Give sentence with me, O God, and defend my cause against the ungodly people: O deliver me from the deceitful and wicked man.
M: For thou art the God of my strength; why hast thou put me from thee: and why go I so heavily, while the enemy opresseth me?

P: O send out thy light and thy truth, that they may lead me and bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy dwelling.
M: And that I may go unto the altar of God, even unto the God of my joy and gladness and upon the harp will I give thanks unto thee, O God, my God.

P: Why art thou so heavy, O my soul and why art thou so disquieted within me.
M: O put thy trust in God for I will yet give him thanks, which is the help of my countenance, and my God.

P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost
M: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen.

P: I will go unto the altar of God
R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness
P: Our help is in the Name of the Lord.
R: Who hath made heaven and earth.

Confiteor P: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles

R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness

P: Give sentence with me, O God, and defend my cause against the ungodly people: O deliver me from the deceitful and wicked man.
R: For thou art the God of my strength, why hast thou put me from thee and why go I so heavily, while the enemy opresseth me?

P: O send out thy light and thy truth, that they may lead me: and bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy dwelling.
R: And that I may go unto the altar of God, even unto the God of my joy and gladness: and upon the harp will I give thanks unto thee, O God, my God.

P: Why art thou so heavy, O my soul: and why art thou so disquieted within me.
R: O put thy trust in God for I will yet give him thanks: which is the help of my countenance, and my God.

P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost
R: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen.

P: I will go unto the altar of God
R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness
P: Our help is in the ✠ Name of the Lord.
R: Who hath made heaven and earth

P: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the

R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness

P: Give sentence with me, O God, and defend my cause against the ungodly people O deliver me from the deceitful and wicked man.
M: For thou art the God of my strength, why hast thou put me from thee and why go I so heavily, while the enemy opresseth me?

P: O send out thy light and thy truth, that they may lead me and bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy dwelling.
M: And that I may go unto the altar of God, even unto the God of my joy and gladness and upon the harp will I give thanks unto thee, O God, my God.

P: Why art thou so heavy, O my soul and why art thou so disquieted within me.
M: O put thy trust in God for I will yet give him thanks, which is the help of my countenance, and my God.

P: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost
M: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen.

P: I will go unto the altar of God
R: Even unto the God of my joy and gladness
P: Our help is in the Name of the Lord.
R: Who hath made heaven and earth.

P: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles

	Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you brethren, to pray to the Lord our God for me.	Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, brethren, to pray to the Lord our God for me.	Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, *(Here thrice strike the breast)* through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you brethren, to pray to the Lord our God for me.
Misereautr	R: Almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee thy sins, and bring thee to everlasting life. P: Amen	R: Almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life. P: Amen	P: Almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee thy sins, and bring thee to everlasting life. R: Amen
	M: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and thee Father, to pray to the Lord our God for me.	R: I confess to Almighty God . . . and to you, Father: that I have sinned . . . *etc.*	R: I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the Saints, and to thee, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, *(Here thrice strike the breast)* through my fault, through my own fault, through my own most grievous fault. Therefore, I beg Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and thee Father, to pray to the Lord our God for me.
	P: Almighty God have mercy upon *you*, forgive *you your* sins, and bring *you* to everlasting life. R: Amen	P: Almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life. R: Amen.	P: Almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to everlasting life. R: Amen
	P: ✠ The Almighty and merciful Lord grant us		P: The Almighty and merciful Lord grant us pardon, ✠ absolution, and remission of our sins.

	pardon, absolution, and remission of our sins. R: Amen. P: Wilt thou not turn again and quicken us, O God? R: That thy people may rejoice in thee. P: Shew us thy mercy, O Lord. R: And grant us thy salvation. P: Lord, hear my prayer. R: And let my cry come unto thee.	P: May the Almighty and merciful Lord grant us pardon, absolution, ✠ and remission of our sins. R: Amen. P: Turn us, again, O Lord, and quicken us. R: That thy people may rejoice in thee. P: O Lord, show Thy mercy upon us. R: And grant us thy salvation. P: Lord, hear my prayer. R: And let my cry come unto thee. P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray. *The priest proceeds to the altar and reverences it with a kiss.* *The appointed psalm verse is said or sung. The priest, standing at the altar, says the opening devotion.*	R: Amen. P: Wilt thou not turn again and quicken us, O God? R: That thy people may rejoice in thee. P: Shew us thy mercy, O Lord. R: And grant us thy salvation. P: Lord, hear my prayer. R: And let my cry come unto thee.
Collect for Purity	P: Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known and from whom no secrets are hid: cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy Name. Through Christ our Lord. R: Amen *The Priest ascends to the altar saying:* Take away from us, we beseech thee, O Lord,	P: Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known and from whom no secrets are hid; Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name. Through Christ our Lord. R: Amen	P: Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known and from whom no secrets are hid: cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy Name. Through Christ our Lord. R: Amen

all our iniquities that we may enter the holy of holies with pure minds. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

And kissing the altar, he says:

We beseech thee, O Lord, by the prayers of thy Saints [whose relics are here], that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive us all our sins. Amen.

At High Mass, incense is set with appropriate prayers, after which the altar and Priest are censed. But NOTE, that incense is not used during the Introit at Nuptial Masses or at Masses for the Dead.

The Introit is then sung by the Choir or said by the Celebrant. In some places, the people respond to the Gloria Patri, *"As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."*

Summary of the Law

P: Hear what our Lord Jesus Christ saith: Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

P: Hear what our Lord Jesus Christ saith: Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

P: Hear what our Lord Jesus Christ saith: Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.

Said privately by the Priest, as he ascends to the Altar.

P: Put away our iniquities far from us, O Lord,

we beseech thee, that with pure minds we may be worthy to enter into the Holy of holies. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

P: We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits [of thy Saints who relicks are here, and] of all thy Saints, that it may please thee to forgive me all my sins. Amen.

At Solemn Mass, the Altar and Priest are incensed.

The Priest now goes to the Epistle corner of the Alter and read the Introit (which at Sung Mass is usually chanted during the foregoing devotions). The opening.

Then shall be said standing or sung:

Here, if the Decalogue hath been omitted, shall be said opening litany or general supplication:

Kyrie	Kyrie, eleison. (Lord, have mercy upon us.) Kyrie, eleison. (Lord, have mercy upon us.) Kyrie, eleison. (Lord, have mercy upon us.) Christe, eleison. (Christ, have mercy upon us.) Christe, eleison. (Christ, have mercy upon us.) Christe, eleison. (Christ, have mercy upon us.) Kyrie, eleison. (Lord, have mercy upon us.) Kyrie, eleison. (Lord, have mercy upon us.)	Lord, Have mercy upon us. (Kyrie, eleison) Lord, Have mercy upon us. (Kyrie, eleison) Lord, Have mercy upon us. (Kyrie, eleison) Christ, Have mercy upon us. (Christe, eleison) Christ, Have mercy upon us. (Christe, eleison) Christ, Have mercy upon us. (Christe, eleison) Lord, Have mercy upon us. (Kyrie, eleison) Lord, Have mercy upon us. (Kyrie, eleison)	Lord, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us.

	Kyrie, eleison. (Lord, have mercy upon us.)	Lord, Have mercy upon us. (Kyrie, eleison)	
	When appointed, the following humn is sung or said, all standing, the priest first intoning:		*Standing in the middle of the Altar, the Celebrant bows his head and says*
Gloria in excelsis	P: Glory be to God on high	P: Glory be to God on high,	P: Glory be to God on high
	R: And on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.	R: And on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.	R: And on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, (*Here bow the head*) we worship thee, we glorify thee, (*Here bow the head*) we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.
	O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.	O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.	O Lord, the only-begotten Son, (*Here bow the head*) Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, (*Here bow the head*) receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.
	For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only, O [Jesus] Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory ✠ of God the Father. Amen.	For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only O (Jesus) Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory ✠ of God the Father. Amen.	For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only (*Here bow the head*) O [Jesu] Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory ✠ of God the Father. Amen.
Collect(s)	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: Let us pray.
	The celebrant sings or says the Collect(s) and the People respond:	*Then the priest shall read the appropriate collects for the day, at the end of which is said*	*Then is said the Collect for the Day and any other Prayers, if the Rubrics so require.*

	R: Amen.	. . . world without end. R: Amen.	
Epistle	*The people sit. The Epistle appointed is read and the People respond:*	*The Epistle of the day is read or sung, concluding with*	*The people sit. The Epistle appointed is read and the People respond:*
	R: Thanks be to God.	R: Thanks be to God.	R: Thanks be to God.
Gradual or Alleluia	*The Gradual and Alleluia sentences are sung by the Choir or read by the celebrant.*	*The priest prays to worthily proclaim the Gospel, incense is set, and the Book of the Gospels censed after the salutation:*	*The Gradual and Alleluia sentences are sung by the Choir or read by the celebrant*.
Prayers before the Gospel	*The Deacon or Priest who is to say or sing the Gospel then says*		*The Deacon or Priest who is to say or sin the Gospel says:*
Munda cor meum	P: Cleanse my heart and my lips, O almighty God, who didst cleans the lips of the prophet Isaiah with a burning coal, and in thy gracious mercy so purify me that I may worthily proclaim thy holy Gospel. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.		P: Cleanse my heart and my lips, O thou Almighty God, who didst purge the lips of Isaiah the Prophet with a life coal and of thy sweet mercy vouchsafe so to purify me, that I may worthily proclaim thy holy Gospel. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. *At Solemn Mass the Deacon now asks for the Celebrant's blessing, but at Low Mass the Celebrant himself asks God for a blessing.*
Jube, Domine	P: May the Lord be in my [thy] hear and on my [thy] lips that I may [thou mayest] worthily attend to his Holy Gospel. Amen. *At High Masses, incense is set with appropriate prayers and the Gospel is censed after the salutation.*		R: Pray, Lord, give me thy blessing. (P): The Lord be in thy (my) heart and on thy (my) lips, that worthily and rightly thou (I) may proclaim his Gospel. Amen. *Here the Gospel book and the Priest or Deacon who is to say or sing the Gospel are censed.*
	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit.

Gospel	P: The (+) continuation (beginning) of the Holy Gospel according to (*Name*):	P: The continuation (beginning) of the Holy Gospel according to (*Name*):	
	The people sign themselves on the forehead, lips, and breast.	*The people, standing, sign themselves on the forehead, lips, and breast.*	*When the Holy Gospel is announced, the People make the holy Sign on their forehead, lips, and breast and say:*
	R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.	R: Glory to thee, O Lord.	R: Glory to thee, O Lord.
	After the Gospel, the People say,	*The Gospel is then read or sung, concluding with:*	*After the Gospel is said*:
	R: Praise be to thee, O Christ.	R: Praise be to thee, O Christ.	R: Praise be to thee, O Christ.
Sermon		*Here, the sermon may be delivered and announcements made. But note the sermon may be delivered at another place, at the discretion of the priest.*	*The sermon is given here, or after the creed. Then shall be declared unto the People what Holy Days, or Fasting Days, are in the week following to be observed, and other announcements.*
	On Sundays and other Major Feasts there follows, all standing		*In the midst of the Altar, the Priest says (if it is to be said):*
Creed	I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;	I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible	P: I believe in one God R: The Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and Of all things visible and invisible
	R: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God; Begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; Begotten, not made; Being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made; Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heave, (*kneel*) And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost	R: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God; Begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God; Begotten, not made; Being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made; Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heave, (*kneel*) And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost	And in one Lord (*Here bow the head*) Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God; Begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God; Begotten, not made; Being of one substance with the Father; By whom all things were made; Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heave, (*Here genuflect*) And

	of the Virgin Mary, And was made man; (*rise*) And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures And ascended into heave, And sitteth on the right hand of the Father And he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; Whose Kingdom shall have no end	of the Virgin Mary, And was made man; (*rise*) And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures And ascended into heave, And sitteth on the right hand of the Father And he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; Whose Kingdom shall have no end	was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, And was made man; (*Here rise*) And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures And ascended into heave, And sitteth on the right hand of the Father And he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; Whose Kingdom shall have no end.
	And I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Lord, and Giver of Life, Who proceedth from the Father; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; Who spake by the Prophets And I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, I acknowledge on Baptism for the remission of sins, And I look for the Resurrection of the dead, ✠ and the Life of the world to come. Amen.	And I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Lord, and Giver of Life, Who proceedth from the Father; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; Who spake by the Prophets And I believe One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, I acknowledge on Baptism for the remission of sins, And I look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the Life ✠ of the world to come. Amen.	And I believe in the Holy Ghost, The Lord, and Giver of Life, Who proceedth from the Father and the Son; Who with the Father and the Son (*Here bow the head*) together is worshiped and glorified; Who spake by the Prophets And I believe one [Holy] Catholic and Apostolic Church, I acknowledge on Baptism for the remission of sins, And I look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the Life ✠ of the world to come. Amen.
	Then shall be declared unto the People what Holy Days, or Fasting Days, are in the week following to be observed; notice shall be given of the Banns of Matrimony, and of any other matters to be published.	*The Creed is said on all Sundays and Greater Feasts, but is omitted at Nuptial and Requiem Masses.*	
(*Sermon*)	*The Sermon may follow here.*		
	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit. P: Let us pray.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit. P: Let us pray.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit. P: Let us pray.
Offertory	*The offertory verse is sung by the Choir or said by the Celebrant. A hymn or anthem may be sung; a collection may be taken. As the priest*	*The appropriate verse is said or sung. A Hymn may be sung while the priest prepares the offerings of bread and wine with the*	

prepares and offers bread and wine, he says the following prayers:

appropriate prayers. At Solemn Mass, incense is set and the offering, altar, celebrant, and people are censed. This being done, the priest turns to the people and bids them to share in the offering.

P: Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou are exalted as head above all.

And the Priest shall then offer, and place upon the Holy Table, the Bread and Wine.

The Priest lifts up the Host on the Paten, and then makes therewith over the Corporal the Sign of the Cross, saying meanwhile:

P: Accept, O holy Father, almighty and everlasting God, this unspotted host which I, unworthy servant, offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences and negligences, as also for those here present and for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may avail me and them unto life everlasting. Amen.

P: Receive, O Holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God, this spotless Host, which I thine unworthy servant now offer unto thee, my God, the living and the true, for all my countless sins, wickedness, and neglect; and for all those here present; as also for all the faithful in Christ, both quick and dead; that it may set forward their salvation and mine unto life everlasting. Amen.

Suscipe, sancte Pater

The Priest at the Epistle side of the Altar pours wine into the Chalice.

O God, who in creating human nature hast wonderfully dignified it and still more wonderfully reformed it, grant that by the mystery of this water and wine, we may

O God, who didst lay the foundation of man's being in wonder and honour, and in greater wonder and honour didst renew the same: grant by the mystery of this water and wine, that he

Deus,qui humanae substantiae

become partakers of his divine nature who deigned to partake of our human nature, thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God; throughout all the ages. Amen.

who was partaker of our humanity may make us join-heirs of his very Godhead, even Jesus Christ they Son our Lord. Who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

The Priest returns to the centre, lifts up the Chalice and then makes therewith the Sign of the Cross, saying meanwhile:

Offerimus tibi

We offer unto thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching thy mercy, that it may ascend before thy divine majesty as a sweet odour for our salvation and for that of the whole world. Amen.

We offer unto thee, O Lord, the Cup of Salvation; beseeching thy mercy that it may ascend in the sight of thy Divine Majesty as a sweet-smelling savor for our salvation, and that of the whole world. Amen.

The Priest bows and says:

In spiritu humilitatis

Accept us, O Lord, in the spirit of humility and contrition of heart: and grant that the sacrifice we offer this day in thy sight may be pleasing to thee, O Lord God.

In a contrite heart and an humble spirit let us be accepted of thee, O Lord, and so let our sacrifice be in thy sight this day that it may be well pleasing unto thee, O Lord our God.

The Priest raises himself and makes the Sign of the Cross over the oblations, saying:

Veni, sanctificator

Come O almighty and eternal God the sanctifier, bless this sacrifice prepared for the glory of thy holy Name.

Come, O thou Sanctifier, Almighty and Everlasting God, and bless this sacrifice made ready for thy Holy Name.

At High mass, incense is set with the following prayers:

At high masses, incense is set:

Per

Through the intercession of Blessed Michael

By the intercessionn of blessed Michael the

intercessionem the Archangel standing at the right hand of the altar of incense, and of all his elect, may the Lord vouchsafe to (+) bless this incense and receive it for a sweet smelling savour. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Oblations, altar, Priest, servers, and people are censed while the priest says:

Incensum istud May this incense, which thou hast blest, ascend unto thee, O Lord: and may thy mercy descend upon us.

Dirigatur, Domine Let my prayer, O Lord, be set forth in thy sight as incense: and let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice. Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth, and keep the door of my lips: O let not mine heart be inclined to any evil thing, let me not be occupied in ungodly works.

As the priest give up the thurible, he says:

Accendat in nobis The Lord kindle in us the fire of his love, and the flame of eternal charity. Amen.

The priest now washes his hands, saying:

Lavabo I will wash my hands in innocency, O Lord,

Archangel, who standeth at the right hand of the Altar of incense, and of all the Elect, may the Lord vouchsafe to bless this incense and accept it as a sweet-smelling savour. Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

While censing the oblations:

Let this incense, blest by thee, O Lord, come up before thee, and let thy mercy come down upon us.

While censing the cross and the altar:

Let my prayer, O Lord, be set forth in thy sight as the incense and let the lifting of my hands be an evening sacrifice. Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth and keep the door of my lips. O let not mine heart be inclined to any evil thing let me not be occupied in ungodly works with the men that work wickedness.

While censing the priest and people:

May the Lord kindle in us the fire of his love, and the flame of his everlasting charity. Amen.

If Alms are to be presented, they are presented at the Altar at this time.

Next, the Priest goes to the Epistle side to wash his hands while saying:

I will wash my hands in innocency, O Lord and so will I go to thine altar. That I may shew the

and so will I go to thine altar. That I may show the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wonderous works. Lord, I have loved the habitation of thine house, and the place where thine honour dwelleth. O shut not up my woul with the sinners, nor my life with the bloodthirsty: in whose hands is wickeness, and their right hand full of gifts. But as for me, I will walk innocently: O deliver me and be merciful to me. My foot standeth right, I will praise the Lord in the congregations.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Suscipe, sancta Trinitas

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to thee in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honour of the blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, of blessed John (the) Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and of all Saints; that I may be available to their honour and our salvation: and that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven, who memory we celebrate on earth. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

voice of thanksgiving and tell of all thy wondrous works. Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house and the place where thine honour dwelleth. O shut not up my soul with the sinners nor my life with the bloodthirsty; In whose hands is wickedness and their right hands is full of gifts. But as for me, I will walk innocently, O deliver me, and be merciful unto me. My foot standeth right, I will praise the Lord in the congregations.

In Masses for the Dead and of the Season of Passiontide, the following is omitted.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be world without end. Amen.

The Priest then returns to the centre, and bowing over, says:

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we offer unto thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ; and in honour of blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, of blessed John Baptist, of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul; of these and all the saints that it may be to their honour and our salvation and that like as we remember them on earth, so in heaven they may plead for us. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Priest says in the subdued voice:

P: Brethren, pray: (*and then adds privately)* that

Orate, fratres	P: Pray, brethren, that this my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty. R: May the Lord receive this sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of His Name, both to our benefit, and that of all His holy Church.	P: Pray, brethren, that this my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty. R: May the Lord receive this sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of His Name, both to our benefit, and that of all His holy Church.	my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty. R: The Lord Receive this sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of his Name both to our benefit and that of all his holy Church. P: Amen.
Secret	*The he adds the Secret prayer(s).*		*Then the Priest, without saying Let us pray, immediately adds the Secrets or (for the Secrets) and the following Prayer for the Church.*
	The Celebrant continues		
	P: Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.	P: Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.	P: Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.
Prayers of the Faithful	P: Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers, and supplications, and to give thanks for all men, We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept (these) our oblations, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord. And grant that all those who do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy Word, and live in the unity of godly love. We beseech thee also, so to direct and dispose the hearts of all Christian Rulers, that they may truly and impartially administer justice, to the	Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers, and supplications, and to give thanks for all men, We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept (these) our oblations, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord. And grant that all those who do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy Word, and live in the unity of godly love. We beseech thee also, so to direct and dispose the hearts of all Christian Rulers, that they may truly and impartially administer justice,	Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers, and supplications, and to give thanks for all men, We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our [alms and] oblations, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord, And grant that all those who do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy Word, and live in the unity of godly love. We beseech thee also, so to direct and dispose the hearts of all Christian Rulers, that they may truly and impartially administer justice, to the

punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of they true religion, and virtue.

Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops and other Ministers, especially (*Name*), our Patriarch, (*Name*) our Metropolitan, and to the Holy Synod of Antioch, that they may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth thy true and lievely Word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments.

And to all thy People, give thy heavenly grace and especially to this congregation here present that, with meek heart and due reverences, they may hear, and receive thy holy Word truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life.

And we most humbly beseech thee, of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succor all those who, in this transitory life, are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity.

And we also bless ✠ thy holy Name of all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them continual growth in thy love and service, and to give us grace so to follow the good example of Blessed Mary and all thy saints, that, through their intercessions, with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.

Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake. Our only Mediator and Advocate.

to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of they true religion, and virtue.

Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops and other Ministers, especially (*Name*), our Patriarch, (*Name*) our Metropolitan, and to the Holy Synod of Antioch, that they may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth thy true and lievely Word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments.

And to all thy People, give thy heavenly grace and especially to this congregation here present that, with meek heart and due reverences, they may hear, and receive thy holy Word truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life.

And we most humbly beseech thee, of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succor all those who, in this transitory life, are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity.

Here may be commemorated specific names.

And we also bless ✠ thy holy Name of all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them continual growth in thy love and service, and to give us grace so to follow the good example of Blessed Mary and all thy saints, that, through their intercessions, with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.

punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of they true religion, and virtue.

Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops and other Ministers, that they may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth thy true and lievely Word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy Sacraments.

And to all thy People, give thy heavenly grace and especially to this congregation here present that, with meek heart and due reverences, they may hear, and receive thy holy Word truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life.

And we most humbly beseech thee, of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succor all those who, in this transitory life, are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity.

And we also bless thy holy Name of all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them continual growth in thy love and service, and to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.

Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake. Our only Mediator and Advocate.
R: Amen.

R: Amen.

Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake. Our only Mediator and Advocate.
R: Amen.

The Celebrant says,

The Priest shall say to those intending to receive Holy Commnunion:

General Confession

P: Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; Draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort; and make your humble confession to Almighty God, devoutly kneeling.

P: Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; Draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort; and make your humble confession to Almighty God, devoutly kneeling.

P: Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; Draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort; and make your humble confession to Almighty God, devoutly kneeling.

R: Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all me; We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, Which we, from time to time, most grievously have committed, By though, word, and deed, Against thy Divine Majesty, Provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, And are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; The remembrance of them is grievous unto us; The burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; For thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, Forgive us all that is past; And grant that we may hereafter Serve and please thee In newness of life, To the honor and glory of thy Name; Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

P: Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all me; We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, Which we, from time to time, most grievously have committed, By though, word, and deed, Against thy Divine Majesty, Provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, And are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; The remembrance of them is grievous unto us; The burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; For thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, Forgive us all that is past; And grant that we may hereafter Serve and please thee In newness of life, To the honour and glory of thy Name; Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

P: Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all me; We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, Which we, from time to time, most grievously have committed, By though, word, and deed, Against thy Divine Majesty, Provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, And are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; The remembrance of them is grievous unto us; The burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; For thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, Forgive us all that is past; And grant that we may hereafter Serve and please thee In newness of life, To the honour and glory of thy Name; Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Bishop when present, or the Priest, stands

Then the Priest (the Bishop if he be present)

	and says	*Then shall the Priest turn to the People, say*	*stand up, and turning to the People, say:*
Absolution	P : Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all those who with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him; Have mercy upon you; ✠ pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. R: Amen.	P: Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all those who with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him; Have mercy upon you; pardon ✠ and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. R: Amen.	P: Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all those who with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him; Have mercy upon you; pardon ✠ and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. R: Amen.
			Then shall the Priest say:
Comfortable Words	P: Hear what comfortable words our Savior Christ saith unto all who truly turn to him. Come unto me, all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. So God loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Hear also what Saint Paul saith. This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Hear also what Saint John saith. If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the Propitiation for our sins.	P: Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all who truly turn to him. Come unto me, all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. So God loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Hear also what Saint Paul saith. This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Hear also what Saint John saith. If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the Propitiation for our sins.	P: Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all who truly turn to him. Come unto me, all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. So God loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Hear also what Saint Paul saith. This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Hear also what Saint John saith. If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the Propitiation for our sins.

Preface	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit.
Sursum Corda	P: Lift up your hearts. R: We lift them up onto Lord. P: Let us give thanks unto our Lord God. R: It is meet and right so to do.	P: Lift up your hearts. R: We lift them up onto Lord. P: Let us give thanks unto our Lord God. R: It is meet and right so to do.	P: Lift up your hearts. R: We lift them up unto the Lord. P: Let us give thanks unto our Lord God. R: It is meet and right so to do.
	P: It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, and everlasting God.	P: It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, and everlasting God.	P: It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy, Father Almighty, Everlasting God.
	Here a Proper Preface is sung or said as appointed.	*Here shall follow the proper preface, if there be one, followed by*	*Here shall follow the Proper Preface according to the time, if there be any specially appointed; or else immediately shall be said or sung by the priest.*
	P: Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying,	P: Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying,	P: Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying: *Here it is customary to ring the bell thrice.*
Sanctus *Benedictus*	A: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are fully of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. Blessed ✠ is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. Hosannah in the highest.	Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are fully of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. Blessed ✠ is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord. Hosannah in the highest.	R: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, Heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. (*After which it is customary to add:*) Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.
Canon	P: All glory be to thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full,	P: All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Fahter, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy, didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who there (by His own oblation of himself once offered) made a full, perfect,	P: All glory be to thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that thou, of thy tender mercy, didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient

	perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; And did institute, and in his holy Gospel commanded us to continue a Perpetual Memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again.	and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious death and sacrifice until His coming again:	sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; And did institute, and in his holy Gospel commanded us to continue a Perpetual Memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again.
	The bell rings once.	*A bell rings once*.	*The bell is rung.*
Verba	For on the night in which he was betrayed, he took Bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples saying Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me.	For on the night in which He was betrayed, He took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of Me.	For on the night in which he was betrayed, he took Bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples saying Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me.
	The bell rings thrice.	*The bell is rung.*	*The bell is rung.*
	Likewise, after supper, he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.	Likewise, after supper, He took the cup; and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; For this is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; Do this as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.	Likewise, after supper, he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.
	The bell rings thrice.	*The bell is rung.*	*The bell is rung.*
	Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Savior Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the Memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion and	Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Savior Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed	Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Savior Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the Memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious

precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to send down thy Holy Spirit upon these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be changed into the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son. Grant that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, we may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood

And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of Thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be changed into the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son. Grant that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

R: Amen. Amen. Amen.

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving most humbly beseeching thee to grant that, by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

P:And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that, by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we, and all Thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving most humbly beseeching thee to grant that, by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most previous Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus

And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most previous Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most previous Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus

Christ, be ✠ filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in us, and we in him.

The names of the faithful departed in some places remembered before God here in the Canon, along with those triumphant in heaven. To this end, the ancient prayers are here given:

Be mindful also, O Lord, of thy servants who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and who rest in the sleep of peace. (*Here the departed are commemorated.*) To them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ grant we pray thee a place of refreshment, light, and peace. To us sinners also, thy servants, confident in the multitude of thy mercies, grant some lot and partnership with thy holy Apostles and Martyrs: John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all thy Saints, into whose company we pray thee of thy mercy to admit us.

And though we are unworthy, thorough our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounded duty and service, not weighting our merits, but pardoning our offences. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. By whom and with whom and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty. World without end.

Christ, be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in us, and we in Him.

And though we are unworthy, thorough our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounded duty and service, not weighting our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom and with whom and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty; world without end.

Christ, be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in us, and we in him.

The names of the faithful departed in some places remembered before God here in the Canon, along with those triumphant in heaven. To this end, the ancient prayers are here given:

Remember, Lord, also the souls of thy servants and handmaidens, which are gone before us with the mark of faith, and rest in the sleep of peace, N. and N. We beseech thee, O Lord, that unto them, and unto all such as rest in Christ, thou wilt grant a place of refreshing, of light, and of peace. And vouchsafe to give unto us some portion and fellowship with thy holy Apostles and Martyrs, with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucia, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all thy saints within whose fellowship we beseech thee to admit us.

And though we are unworthy, thorough our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounded duty and service, not weighting our merits, but pardoning our offences. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. By whom and with whom and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty. World without end.

R: Amen.

R: Amen.

R: Amen.

P: Let us pray: And now as our Saviour Christ hath taught us, we are bold to say

Our Father

P: Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. [For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.]

P: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. (For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.)

P: Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. [For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.]

Except at all Low Masses, Nuptial Masses, and Requiem Masses, the doxology may be added.

The Doxology is omitted from the Lord's Prayer at all Low, Nuptial, and Requiem Masses.

The Priest continues:

The Priest now says the prayer for the Fracture, or Breaking of the Bread, and exchanges the Pax, or Peace, with the congregation.

P: Deliver us, we beseech thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come and at the intercession of the blessed and glorious Ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of God, with thy blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and with Andrew, and with all the Saints, give peace graciously in our days, that we, being holpen by the succor of thy mercy, may both always be free from sin and safe from all disquietude. Through the same Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, ever one God.

P: Deliver us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come: And at the intercession of the blessed, glorious, and Ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of God, with that of Thy blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and of Andrew and all Thy Saints favorably grant peace in our time, that we may ever be kept free from sin, and safe from all disquietude; through the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son our Lord, who with Thee in the Unity of the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth one God,

P: Deliver us, we beseech thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come and at the intercession of the blessed and glorious Ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of God, with thy blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and with Andrew, and with all the Saints, give peace graciously in our days, that we, being holpen by the succor of thy mercy, may both always be free from sin and safe from all disquietude. Through the same Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, ever one God.

Fracture	*The Celebrant breaks the consecrated Bread and then sings or says,*		*The bell is rung during the fraction of the host.*
	P: World without end. R: Amen.	P: world without end. R: Amen.	P: World without end. R: Amen.
Peace	P: The peace of the Lord be always with you. R: And with thy Spirit.	P: The peace of the Lord be always with you. R: And with thy Spirit.	P: The peace of the Lord be always with you. R: And with thy Spirit.
	The Priest continues:		*After which is said privately:*
	P: May this mixture and consecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be effectual for us who receive it unto eternal life. Amen.		P: May this mingling and consecration of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord be unto us who receive it an approach to everlasting life. Amen.
	The following is sung or said:		*Then is said or sung:*
Agnus Dei	P: O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world grant us thy peace.	P: O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world grant us thy peace.	P: O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world grant us thy peace.
	In Masses for the Dead, in place of "Have mercy upon us*" is said* "grant them rest*", and in place of* "grant us thy peace*" is said* "grant them rest eternal.*"*	*In Masses for the dead, in place of,* Have mercy upon us*, is said,* grant them rest*, and in place of,* grant us thy peace*, is said,* grant them rest eternal*.*	*In Masses for the dead,* grant them rest*, and* grant them rest eternal.
	The following prayer is said, except in Masses for the Dead:		*After which is said privately in Masses for the Living:*
	P: O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to thine		P: O Lord Jesus Christ, who sadist to thine

Apostles, peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, regard not our sins, but the faith of thy Church: and grant her that peace and unity which are agreeable to thy will. Who livest and reignest for ever and ever. Amen.

The Priest continues,

Prayer of Humble Access

P: We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O Merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou are the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our souls washed through his most previous Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.

R: Amen.

P: O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who by the will of the Father and the cooperation of the Holy Ghost hast, by thy death, given life to the world, deliver me, I beseech thee, by this thy most holy Body and Blood from all iniquities and from every evil. Make me ever obedient to thy commandments, and suffer me not to be ever separated from thee, who livest and reignest with God the

Then shall the priest and people say together:

We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O Merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou are the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our souls washed through his most previous Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.

R: Amen.

Apostles, Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto: regard not my sins, but the faith of thy Church; and grant to it that peace and unity which is according to thy will. Who livest and reignest God, world without end. Amen.

P: We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O Merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou are the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our souls washed through his most previous Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.

R: Amen.

The foregoing Prayer is often substituted for the following two prayers:

P: O Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, whom the Father with the Holy Ghost hath willed by death to make the world to live by this most holy Body and Blood of thine, set me free from all my sins, and from all evil things and make me in such wise ever to abide in thy commands that I may never be separated from thee. Who with the same God the Father and

Father, in the unity of the same Spirit, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

P: Let not the participation of thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I albeit unworthily, receive, be to me for judgment and condemnation; but by thy goodness may it be a safeguard and remedy both to soul and body, who with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, livest and reignest, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.

At the Priest's Communion, he says:

Communion

P: I will take the bread of heave and call upon the name of the Lord.

Then thrice:

P: Lord, I am not worth that thou shouldst come under my roof, but speak the word only and my soul shall be healed.

The bell rings thrice.

As the priest receives the Body, he says:

May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ

the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest one God for ever and ever. Amen.

Here the Priest shall continue:

P: O Lord Jesus Christ, I, thine unworthy servant, do presume to take thy body, but let not this act be to my judgment and condemnation rather, of they mercy let it ward me in body and soul, and shew thy healing forth in me. Who livest and reignest with God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

P: I will receive the bread of heaven and call upon the name of the Lord.

The priest now thrice strikes his breast and says.

P: Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof, but speak the word only and my soul shall be healed.

The priest makes his own communion. The bell may ring three times, signaling the people to come forward for Communion. Turning to the faithful, the priest says:

Then shall the Priest first receive the Holy Communion in both kinds himself and proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priest and Deacons, in like manner (if any be present,) and, after that, to the People also in order.

After the Celebrant has received the Body of our Lord, he says the following:

preserve my soul unto everlasting life. Amen.

After which, he says:

P: What reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that he hath done unto me? I will receive the cup of salvation and call upon the Name of the Lord. I will call upon the Lord, which is worthy to be praised, so shall I be safe from mine enemies.

He then receives the Precious Blood, saying:

P: May the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto everlasting life.

P: ✠ Behold the Lamb of God, behold him that taketh away the sins of the world.

The Celebrant and People respond three times,

Lord, I am not worth that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my soul shall be healed.

P: What reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that hat done unto me? I will receive the cup of salvation and call upon the Name of the Lord. I will call upon the Name of the Lord, which is worthy to be praised, so shall I be safe from mine enemies.

P: Soul of Christ, sanctify me. Body of Christ, save me. Blood of Christ, inebriate me. Water from the side of Christ, wash me. Passion of Christ, strengthen me. O good Jesu, hear me. Within my wounds hide me. Suffer me not to be separated from thee. From the malicious enemy defend me. In the hour of my death call me, And bid me come to thee, That with thy Saints I may praise thee For ever and ever. Amen.

P: Behold the Lamb of God; behold him that takest away the sins of the world.

Repeated three times:

P: Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst come under my roof;
R: But speak the word only and my soul shall

P: Behold the Lamb of God, behold him that taketh away the sins of the world.

The following words are said by the Priest and People together thrice:

P: Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof but speak the word only and my soul shall be healed.

be healed.

The people say this prayer of preparation before receiving the Sacrament:

I believe, O Lord, and I confess that Thou art truly the Christ, the son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. And I believe that this is truly Thine own immaculate Body, and that this is truly Thine own previous Blood. Wherefore I pray Thee, have mercy upon me and forgive me my transgressions, both voluntary and involuntary, of word and deed, of knowledge and of ignorance; and make me worthy to partake without condemnation of Thine immaculate mysteries, unto remission of my sins and unto life everlasting. Amen.

[Of thy Mystic Supper, O Son of God, accept me today as a communicant: for I will not speak of thy Mysterty to thine enemies, neither will I give thee a kiss as did Judas; but like the thief I will confess thee: Remember me, O Lord, in thy Kingdom. Not unto judgement nor unto condemnation be my partaking of thy Holy Mysteries, O Lord, but unto the healing of soul and body.]

The priest and people say together the following prayer in preparation to receive Holy Communion:

I believe, O Lord, and I confess that Thou art truly the Christ, the son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief. And I believe that this is truly Thine own immaculate Body, and that this is truly Thine own previous Blood. Wherefore I pray Thee, have mercy upon me and forgive me my transgressions, both voluntary and involuntary, of word and deed, of knowledge and of ignorance; and make me worthy to partake without condemnation of Thine immaculate mysteries, unto remission of my sins and unto life everlasting. Amen.

The Body and Blood of Christ are given to the communicants with these words,

P: The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

The priest and assisting clergy communicate the people with the following words

P: The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in

And when the Priest deliverth the Bread, he says:

P: The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in

remembrance that Chirst for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

For the chalice:

P: The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

If the Body and Blood are administered together.

P: The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given and shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

After Communion, the priest performs the Ablutions, cleaning the sacred vessels. If the propers are being changed, the Communion verse for the day is sung at this point. If not sung, it is read following the Communion.

remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

And the Minister who delivereth the Cup shall say:

P: The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

When all have communicated the Priest shall return to the Holy Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated Elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth.

P: The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.

During the ministration of Communion, hymns, Psalms, or anthems may be sung.

At the ablutions, the Priest says,

P: What we have partaken with our mouth, O Lord, may we receive with a pure heart, and of a temporal gift, may it become to us and eternal remedy.

P: May the Body and Blood which I have received cleave unto my heart, O Lord; and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, having been fed with this pure and holy sacrament. Who livest and reignest in the unity

P: Grant that what we have received with the mouth, O Lord, we may keep with a pure heart and that from this temporal gift may come unto us life everlasting.

P: May thy Flesh which I have taken and thy Blood which I have drunk, O Lord, cleave unto mine inmost soul and grant that no spot of sin may abide in me, whose meat hath been thine incorrupt and holy sacraments, Who livest and

	of the Holy Ghost, God, throughout all ages of ages. Amen.		reignest for ever and ever. Amen.
	The proper Communion sentence is then said or sung.		
	After Communion the Celebrant says,	*The priest and the people shall say together:*	*Then shall the Priest say:*
Post-Communion	P: Let us pray. Almighty and everlasting God, we most heartily thank thee for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through the hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of his most precious death and passion. And we humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end.	P: Almighty and everliving God, We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spritiual food fo the most previous Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and dost assure us thereby of Thy favor and goodness towards us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through hope of Thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of His most precious death and passion. And we humbly beseech Thee, o heavenly Father, so to assist us with Thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as Thou has prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ, our Lord, to whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honor and glory, world without end. Amen.	P: Let us pray. Almighty and everlasting God, we most heartily thank thee for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through the hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of his most precious death and passion. And we humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end.
	R: Amen.		R: Amen.
	The Celebrant then says the Postcommunion Collect(s).	*Then are said or sung, the Post-Communion Collects that are appointed for the day, ending with*	*Then is sung the proper communion hymn. After which he says the post-communion collects.*
		. . . world without end.	

R: Amen

Dismissal

The Deacon, or the Celebrant, dismisses the people with these words:

P: The Lord be with you.
R: And also with you.

Then, if it is a day upon which the Gloria has been said, he turns to the people and says,

P: Depart in peace.
R: Thanks be to God

From the Easter Vigil through Low Saturday "Alleluia, alleluia" is added to the dismissal and response.

At other times is said,

P: Let us bless the Lord.
R: Thanks be to God.

Or, at a Requiem,

P: May they rest in peace.
R: Amen.

The priest then says:

P: Let the obedient performance of my bounden duty be pleasing to thee, O holy Trinity, and grant that this sacrifice which I, unworthy that I am, have offered in the sight of thy majest, may be acceptable unto thee and may through thy mercy, obtain thy favour for

P: The Lord be with you
R: And with thy Spirit.

P: Depart in peace.
R: Thanks be to God.

Or, in penitential seasons,

P: Let us bless the Lord.
R: Thanks be to God.

At Requiem Masses is said:

P: May they rest in peace.
R: Amen.

Then the dismissal is said or sung by the Deacon or the Priest.

P: The Lord be with you.
R: And also with you.

or

P: Depart in peace.
R: Thanks be to God

or

P: Let us bless the Lord.
R: Thanks be to God.

In Masses for the Dead

P: May they rest in peace.
R: Amen.

Then the priest says privately:

P: Let this my bounden duty and service be pleasing unto thee, O Holy Trinity and grant that this sacrifice which I, all unworthily, have offered in the sight of thy Majesty, may be acceptable unto thee and be for me and all them for whom I have offered it, a propitiation of thy

	myself and all those in whose behalf I have offered it. Who livest and reignest, God, throughout all the ages of ages. Amen.		lovingkindness. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.
	The Bishop when present, or the Priest, gives the blessing, but NOTE that the blessing is not given at a Requiem.		*Then the People kneeling, the Priest (the Bishop if he be present) shall let them depart with this Blessing which is not said in Mass for the Dead.*
	P: The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. And the blessing of God Almighty, the ✠ Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be amongst you and remain with you always. R: Amen	P: The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord: and the Blessing of God Almighty, the Father (+), the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always. R: Amen.	P: The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, ✠ and the Holy Ghost be amongst you and remain with you always. R: Amen
	Then may be said, all standing:	*Then may be said, all standing:*	*Here is read the following Gospel or some other Gospel when the Rubrics of the Missal provide one.*
	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: ✠ The beginning of the Holy Gospel according to St. John. R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy spirit. P: The beginning of the Holy Gospel according to St. John. R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.	P: The Lord be with you. R: And with thy Spirit P: The Beginning of the Holy Gospel according to John. R: Glory be to thee, O Lord.
Last Gospel	*Or, if another Gospel is to be read, he says:* The Continuation of the Holy Gospel according to N.		
	P: In the beginning…. R: Thanks be to God.	P: In the beginning…. R: Thanks be to God.	P: In the beginning…. R: Thanks be to God.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Liturgical Books, Documents, and Manuscripts

Antiochian Western Rite Vicariate. *The Divine Liturgy According to the Rite of Saint Tikhon: The Book of Common Prayer Authorized for Orthodox Use, a Study Text not Designed for Public Use*. Stanton: Saint Luke's Priory Press, n.d.

-----. 'The Divine Liturgy: Western Rite.' Stanton: Saint Luke's Priory Press n.d.

-----. *The English Office: Morning Prayer and Evensong for Public or Private Use*. Stanton: Saint Luke's Priory Press, 1989.

-----. '*Missa Pro Defunctis*: A Short and Easy Setting of the Requiem, for All Souls' Day, Burials, and Other Occasions.' Stanton: Saint Luke's Priory Press n.d.

-----. *The Orthodox Missal According to the Use of the Western Rite Vicariate of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America*. Stanton: Saint Luke's Priory Press, 1995.

-----. *The Orthodox Ritual According to the Usage of the Western Rite Vicariate of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America*. Reprint. Stanton: Saint Luke's Priory Press, 1993 (1962).

The Book of Common Prayer: The Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church: In the English Parochial Tradition, According to Orthodox Catholic Usage. Glendale: Lancelot Andrewes Press, 2009.

The Catholic Missal, Being a Translation of Missale Romanum Arranged for Daily Use. Charles J. Callan and John A. McHugh (eds). New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1934.

The English Ritual: The Book of Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Church in England Together With the Form and Manner of Blessing Certain Persons and Things and With Sundry Prayers and Devotions. London: W. Knott and Son, Ltd., 1946?.

The Episcopal Church. *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David*. New York: James Pott & Co., 1892.

-----. *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David*. New York: Church Pension Fund, 1929.

-----. *Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer*. Church Hymnal Corp., 1976.

Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen age. Five Vols. Michel Andrieu (ed.). Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense, 1948.

The Monastic Diurnal. Douglas, Charles W (ed.). Reprint. Lancelot Andrewes Press, 2005 (1963).

Overbeck, Julian J. *Liturgia Missae Orthodoxo-Catholicae Occidentalis*. London: Taylor and Co., 1871.

The Roman Ritual/Rituale Romanum. Weller, Phillip T. (ed.). Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1964.

Society of Saint Basil. 'Christian Initiation'. Mount Vernon: Society of Saint Basil, 1963.

-----. *Missal for Use of Orthodox*. Mount Vernon: Society of Saint Basil, 1963.

-----. 'The Order for the Baptism of Infants'. Mount Vernon: Society of Saint Basil, 1963.

-----. 'Sick Call Ritual: According to the Orthodox Western Rite'. Mount Vernon: Society of Saint Basil, 1963.

Society of Saints Peter and Paul. *The Anglican Missal in the American Edition: containing the liturgy from the Book of Common Prayer according to the Use of the Church in the United States of America, Together with Other Devotions and with Ceremonial Directions Proper to the Same*. New York: Frank Gavin Liturgical Foundation, Inc., 1947.

Trigg, Michael E., John Downing, and Karl Steinhoff, eds. *Saint Andrew Service Book: The Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies According to the Western Rite Usage of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America*, 2nd ed. Englewood: Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese, 1996.

-----. *Saint Andrew Service Book: The Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies According to the Western Rite Usage of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America*, 3nd ed. Whittier: Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America, 2005.

Turner, Alexander. *The Western Rite Directory*. Brooklyn: Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of New York and North America, 1962.

-----. 'The Western Rite Vicariate: Liturgical Directives' *Orthodoxy* 9.9 (1963) 282-3.

Primary Sources and First-Person Accounts

1) Pre Modern (to 1800)

Ambrosius (Ambrose of Milan). *Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam Libris X Compreshensa*. *PL* 15.

-----. *De Sacramentis*. *PL* 16.

Alcuinus (Alcuin). *Epistola CXXXVII* (*ad Chrodgarium comitem*). *PL* 100.

Anon. *Epistula ad Diognetum*. *PG* 2.

Athanasius Magnus (Athanasios the Great). *Frgmenta Alia* VII (*ex sermon ad baptizalos*). *PG* 26.

Athenagoras Atheniensis (Athenagoras of Athens). *Legatio pro Christianis*. *PG* 6.

Basilius Magnus (Basil the Great). *Epistula XCIII* (*ad Caesariam patrician*). *PG* 32.

Benedictus Nursinus (Benedict of Nursia). *Regula*, *PL* 66.

Berengarius of Tours, '*De Sacra Coena*' in Wilhelm H. Beekenkamp (ed.), *Berengarii Turonensis de sacra coena adversus Lanfrancum*. Kerkhistorische studiën. dl. 2. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1941.

Clementis Alexandrini (Clement of Alexandria). *Pedagogue*. *PG* 8.

-----. *Stromata*. *PG* 9.

Cranmer, Thomas. 'Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament, 1550' *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*. G. E. Duffield (ed.). Appleford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964.

Cyprianus Carthaginensis (Cyprian of Carthage). *Liber de Uniate Ecclesiae*. *PL* 4.

Cyrilius Heirosolymitanus, Archepiscospus (Cyril of Jerusalem). *Catechesis Mystagocicae*. *PG* 33

Eusebii Pamphili, Caesareae Palaestinae Episcopi (Eusebius of Caesarea). *Historiae Ecclesiastica*. *PG* 20.

Gregorius I Magnus (Gregory I the Great). *Dialogs*. *PL* 77.

Gregorius Theologius (Gregory the Theologian). *Epistola CCXXXIII* (*Ad Diocli)*. *PG* 37.

Ignatius (of Antioch). *Ad Polycarpum*. *PG* 5.

Innocentius I Papa (Pope Innocent I). *Epistola* XXV (*ad Decentio episcopo*). *PL* 20.

Joannes Chrysostomus (John Chrysostom). *De Sacredotio*. *PG* 48.

-----. *Homiliae XVIII Epistolam primam ad Timotheum*. *PG* 62.

Ordo Divini sacrificii sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi. *PG* 63.

Justinus, Philosophus et Martyr (Justin Martyr). *Apologia Prima pro Christianis*. *PG* 6.

Liber Pontificalis (*The Book of the Pontiffs: The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*). Raymond Davis (Trans.). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.

Niceta Romatianae. *Niceta of Remesiana: His Life and Works*. Andrew E. Burn (Trans.). Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1905.

Nicephorus Constantinoplita Patriarcha (Nikephoros the Confessor). *Canones, ex Conciliisi*. *PG* 100

Nicholas Cabasilas. *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*. J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty (Trans.). Reprint. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002 (1978).

Oriegens (Origen). *Libellus de Oratione*. *PG* 11.

Petrus Pictaviensis. *Sententiae*. *PL* 211.

Ratramnus. *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. *PL* 121.

Robertus Pullus. *Sententiae*. *PL* 186.

Tertulianus (Tertullian). *Apologeticus Adversos Gentes Pro Christianis* 16. *PL* 1.

-----. *Ad nations*, 1.13, *PL* 1.

-----. *Ad Uxorem* 23, *PL* 1.

Theodorus Mopsuestenus (Theodore of Mopsuestia). *Commentarii in Novum Testamentum* (*In Evangelium Matthaei Commentarii Fragmentum*). *PG* 66.

2) Modern

Anon. 'The Present Crisis: An Appeal to Ritualists and all Those Who are Sincerely Seraching for the Truth, the Way, and The Life. By a Clergyman Lately Seceded From the Anglican Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 2 (1868) 149-157.

Anon. *The Pilgrim's Tale*. T. Allen Smith (Trans.). New York: Paulist Press, 1999.

Botte, Bernard. *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Reform*. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1988.

Burton, Barnabas. *Strange Pilgrimage*. Welshpool: Stylite Publishing, 1985.

Chambult, Dennis. 'The Origins of the Orthodox Benedictine Community in Paris', *One Church* 9.11-12 (1955) 252-254.

Connely, John C. 'Finding a Home in Western Rite Orthodoxy' in Michael E. Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 15-19. Ben Lomond; Conciliar Press 1993.

Essey, Basil. 'Comments on the Western Rite'. Western Orthodoxy. http://www.westernorthodox.com/basil.html (accessed 14 March 2009).

Gergiannakis, Anthony. Official reply to Fr. Paul W. Schneirla. 22 January 1996. http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html (accessed 14 March 2009).

Liddon, Henry P. *The Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon, Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, and Sometime Ireland Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford*. John O. Johnston (ed.). London: Logmans, Green, and Co., 1904.

Mangels, John A. 'Orthodox Odyssey' in Michael E. Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 20-26. Ben Lomond; Conciliar Press 1993.

McCauley, Patrick. 'Why Would an Episcopalian Become Orthodox' in Michael E. Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 11-14. Ben Lomond; Conciliar Press 1993.

Novikoff, Olga. *The M.P. for Russia: Reminiscences and Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff*. Two Vols. W. T. Stead (ed.). London: Andrew Melrose, 1909.

Ofiesh, Miriam N. *Archbishop Aftimios Ofiesh, 1880-1966: A Biography Revealing his Contribution to Orthodoxy and Christendom*. Sun City West: Aftimios Abihider, 1999.

Overbeck, Julian J. *Die orthodoxe katholische Anschauung im Gegenzatz zum Papstthum und Jesuitismus sowie zum Protestantismus. Nebst einem Rückblick auf die papstliche Enzyklika und den Syllabus vom 8. Decbr. 1864*. Halle a/S: H. W. Schmidt, 1865.

-----. *Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism: A Word About Intercommunion Between the English and the Orthodox Churches*. London: N. Trübner and Co., 1866.

-----. *Die rechtgläubige katholische Kirche. Ein Protest gegen die päpstliche Kirche, und einen Aufforderung zur Grüdung Katholischer National-Kirchen*. Halle a/A: H. W. Schmidt, 1869.

-----. 'The Western Uniate Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 1 (1867) 54-59, 194-196, 274-275.

-----. 'Reconsideration of the Anglican Claims', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 1-14

-----. 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 41-49.

-----. '*Liturgia Missae Orthodoxo-Catholicae Occidentalis*' *Orthodox Catholic Review* 3 (1871) 49-72.

-----. *Die Wiedervereinigung der morgen- und abendländischen Kirche. Ein Rückblick auf den Münchener Altkatholiken-Congress, und ein Vorblick auf die zu lösende Aufgabe. Offener Brief an den Grafen Dmitry Tolstoy*. Halle: H. W. Schmidt, 1873.

-----. 'On the Impossibility of Union Between the Orthodox and the Present Anglican Church' *Orthodox Catholic Review* 5 (1876) 56-76.

-----. 'An Appeal to the patriarchs and Holy Synods of the Orthodox Catholic Church' *Orthodox Catholic Review* 5 (1876) 276-288.

-----. 'Addresses to the Western Orthodox', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 8 (1880) 41-102.

-----. 'The True Old English Church', *Orthodox Catholic Review* 9 (1880) 1-14.

-----. ‘An Account of the Visit of Dr. Overbeck to Constantinople in 1879’. Alexander Kiréev/Kiréeff (ed.). Moscow: Society of Friends of the Religious Enlightenment, 1880.

-----. ‘Addresses to the Western Orthodox’, *Orthodox Catholic Review* 9 (1880) 31-89.

-----. ‘Addresses to the Young’, *Orthodox Catholic Review* 11 (1885) 58-79.

-----. *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church – From the Version of Peter Mogila*. London: Thomas Baker, 1898.

Philaret of Moscow. *Pis’ma Mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta k’ A. N. M....1832-1867*. Kiev: Tip. I. i A. Davidenko, 1869.

Roman, Metropolitan. *A Directory of Western Rite Parishes: Including Clergy and Publications*. Akron: Eastern Christian Press, 1986.

Schneirla, Paul W. Official letter to Metropolitan Anthony (Gergiannakis) of San Francisco. 5 January 1996. http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html (accessed 14 March 2009).

Sergius of Moscow. ‘The Question of Western Orthodoxy’, *One Church* 2.9-10 (1948) 27.

Trigg, Michael E. ‘Our Plea’ in Michael E. Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 27-31. Ben Lomond; Conciliar Press 1993.

Young, Alexy. ‘An Introduction’ in Michael E. Trigg (ed.), *An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*, 5-10. Ben Lomond; Conciliar Press 1993.

3) Ecclesiastical Documents and Encyclicals

Archpastoral Directive. Metropolitan Philip Saliba. 02 May 2003.

Archpastoral Directive on the Vicariate for Palestinian-Jordanian Communities in the USA. Metropolitan Philip Saliba. 07 August 2008. http://www.antiochian.org/files/8-7-08%20Re%20GOA%20Palestinian%20Vicariate.pdf (accessed 09 September 2009).

Archpastoral Directive on the Western Rite. Metropolitan Philip Saliba. 27 November 1979.

Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry. Paper No. 111. Faith and Order Commission, World Council of Churches. 1982.

Communiqué of the Special Commission for Examining the Request of UACORO of the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Information Service of the Serbian Orthodox Church, 14 December 2004. http://www.spc.rs/Vesti-2004/12/14-12-04-e.html (accessed 26 August 2009).

Confession and Communion: A Report to the Holy Synod of Bishops of the Orthodox Church in America. Alexander Schmemann. Sousset: Orthodox Church in America, 1972.

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. *Documents of Vatican II*, 137-182. Ed. Walter M. Abbott and Joseph Gallagher. New York: Guild Press, 1966.

The Decision Regarding the Amending of Articles Concerning Bishops According to the By-Laws of the Patriarchate. Holy Synod of Antioch. 24 February 2009. http://www.antiochian.org/sites/antiochian.org/files/Decision%20(English)%20of%20Synod%20of%20Antioch%202-24-09.pdf (accessed 15 March 2009).

Decision of the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia in the Case of Eugraph John Kovalevsky. ROCOR Synod of Bishops. 29 May 1967. Reprinted in *Orthodoxy* 12.2 (1969) 19

Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume I: Nicaea I to Lateran V. Norman P. Tanner (ed.). London: Sheed & Ward, 1990.

Edict on the Western Rite. Metropolitan Anthony (Bashir). August, 1958. Reprinted as 'Edict on the Western Rite' *The Word* 2.8 (1958).

Four Years Ago. *Quattuor abhinc annos*. Pope John Paul II. 03 October 1984

From the First. *Quo primum*. Pope Pius V. 14 July 1570.

Lettre du Conseil épiscopal de l'Eglise orthodoxe de France. Bishop Germain (Bertrand-Hardy). http://orthodoxie.free.fr/entretiens_bucarest%20-%201986.htm (accessed 26 August 2009).

The Mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity. Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. 6 July 1982. John Borelli and John H. Erickson (eds.). *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*, 53-64. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

Observations on the American 'Book of Common Prayer. Zamechaniya ob' Amerikanskoi 'Knige' Obshchkh Molitv'. Commission on Old Catholic and Anglican Questions of the Russian Holy Synod. 1904. Reprinted as Wilfried

Barnes (Trans.), *Russian Observations Upon the American Prayer Book* (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co., 1917).

Of the Supreme Pontiffs. *Summorum Pontificum*. Pope Benedict XVI. 07 July 2007.

On Certain Matters to Be Observed or Avoided Regarding the Most Holy Eucharist. *Redemptionis Sacramentum*. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. 23 April 2004.

Ordo. Stanton/Spokane: St. Luke's Priory Press, 1998-2010.

Pan-Orthodox Lenten Vespers Sermon. Metropolitan Jonah (Paffhausen). St Seraphim Orthodox Cathedral, Dallas, Texas, 05 April 2009.

Protocol Number 3. Bishop Anthony (Gergiannakis) of San Francisco. 4 October 1995. http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/correspondence.html (accessed 4 March 2009).

Protocole de reception dans las communion de l'Eglise orthodoxe Serbe et de toutes les eglises orthodoxes du groupe appele Jusqu'a present UACORO. Holy Synod of Bishops of the Serbian Orthodox Church, No. 893, 15 June 2005. http://orthodoxe.free.fr/files/Protocole_UACORO.pdf.

Resolutions of the Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad, 1978. ROCOR Synod of Bishops, reprinted in *Newsletter #21*, (January-February 1979), 5. http://www.allmercifulsavior.com/Liturgy/No-Wr-by-ROCOR.pdf (accessed 09 September 2009).

A Response to the Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church Regarding the Munich Document: 'The Mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity'. The United States Orthodox-Catholic Theological Consultation. 25 May 1983. John Borelli and John H. Erickson (eds.). *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*, 65-68. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

Ukase No. 75. Metropolitan Sergius (Stragorodsky). 16 June 1936. Reprinted as David Abramtsov (Trans.), 'Western Rite Ukase' *One Church* 8.4 (1954) 18-23.

Uniatism, Method of Union of the Past, and the Present Search for Full Communion. Joint International Commission for Theological Dialogue Between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. 23 June 1993. John Borelli and John H. Erickson (eds.). *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*, 175-183. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

The Western Rite Vicariate: Liturgical Directives. AWRV. Orthodoxy 9.9 (1963) 282-3.

With Great Sadness the Church Has Learned. *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*. Pope John Paul II. 02 July 1988

Books, Chapters, and Articles

Afanasiev, Nicholas N. 'The Canons of the Church: Changeable or Unchangable?', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 11.2 (1967) 54-68.

Allen, Joseph J. *Widowed Priest: A Crisis in Ministry*. Minneapolis: Light & Life Publishing, 1994.

Anson, Peter F. *Bishops at Large*. London: Farber and Farber, 1964.

Baldovin, John F. *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*. Rome: Pontificum Insitutum Studorium Orientalium, 1987.

-----. *Worship, City, Church, and Renewal*. Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1991.

-----. 'Hippolytus and *The Apostolic Tradition*: Recent Research and Commentary', *Theological Studies* 64.3 (2003) 520-542.

-----. *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2008.

Baumstark, Anton. *Comparative Liturgy*. Westminster: Newman Press, 1958.

Benz, Ernst. *Wittenberg und Byzanz: Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Reformation un der Östlich-Orthodoxen Kirche*. Elwert: Gräfe und Unzer Verlag Marburg, 1949.

Bishop, Edmund. 'Appendix' in R. H. Connolly (ed.), *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai: Translated into English With an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

-----. *Historica Liturgica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918.

Blunt, John H. *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England*. London: Rivengtons, 1866.

Bonsall, Leo. 'The Benedictine Monastery of St. Mary on Mount Athos', *Eastern Churches Review* 2.4 (1969) 262-267.

Bonniwell, William R. *A History of the Dominican Liturgy*. New York: J. F. Wagner, 1944.

Bourne, Vincent (Yvonne Winnaert). *La queste de verite d'Irenee Winnaert: modernisme, ocumenisme, orthodoxie*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1966.

-----. *La Divine contradiction: l'Avenir catholique orthodoxe de la France*. Paris: Librairie des Cinq continents, 1975.

Bouyer, Louis. *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Trans. Charles U. Quinn. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Botte, Bernard. 'Le'épiclèse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14.3 (1947) 241-251.

-----. 'À propos de la "Tradition apostolique"', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33.2 (1966) 177-186.

Bradshaw, Paul F. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002 (1992).

-----. 'Cathedral and Monastic: What's in a Name?', *Worship* 77.4 (2003) 341-53.

-----. 'Who Wrote *The Apostolic Tradition*?: A Response to Alistair Stewart-Sykes', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48.2-3 (2004), 195-206.

-----. *Eucharistic Origins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Bradshaw, Paul F., Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips. *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Brinktrine, Johannes. 'Mysterium Fidei', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 44 (1930) 493-500.

van Bunnen, Alexis. 'Le Orthodox de rit occidental en Europe et aux États-Unis: Bilan et perspectives III', *Irenikon* 54.3 (1981) 331-350.

Capelle, Bernard. *Travaux Liturgigues Vol. II: Historie le Messe*. Louvain, Abbaye du Mont Cesar, 1962.

Cerrato, John. 'The Association of the Name Hippolytus With a Church Order, Now Known as *The Apostolic Tradition*', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 48.2-3 (2004), 179-194.

Chadwick, Henry. *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church From Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Chavasse, Antoine. 'L' Oraison super sindonem dans la liturgie romaine', *Revue bénédictine* 70 (1960) 313-323.

Chupungo, Anscar J. 'History of the Roman Liturgy Until the Fifteenth Century', in Anscar J. Chupungo (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, 131-152. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997.

de Clerck, Paul. *La prière universelle dans les liturgies latines anciennes : témoignages patristiques et textes liturgiques*. Aschendorff: Münster, 1977.

Collins, Roger. *The Arab Conquest of Spain, 710-797*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd., 1989.

Coombs, Stephen. *The Eucharistic Prayer in the Orthodox West: A Reappraisal of its Ancient and Modern History, Peculiarities, and Possibilities; With and Excursus: The Priscillian Tractatus XI an Illatio*. Oxford: The Gregorian Club, 1987.

Corrigan, John, David Morgan, Mark Silk, and William H. Rhys. 'Electronic Media and the Study of American Religion', *Religion and American Culture* 16.1 (2006) 1-24

Cramer, Peter. *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c. 200 – c. 1150*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1993.

Cuschieri, Andrew J. *The Sacrament of Reconciliation: A Theological and Canonical Treatise*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1992.

Dallen, James. *The Reconciling Community: The Rite of Penance*. Volume III of *Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986.

Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1964.

Davis, Leo D. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.

Day, Thomas. *Why Catholics Can't Sing: The Culture of Catholicism and the Triumph of Bad Taste*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Demacopoulos, George E. and Aristotle Papanikolaou. 'Augustine and the Orthodox: "The West" in the East' in Aristotle Papanikolaou and George E. Demacopoulos

(eds.), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, 11-40. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008.

van Dijk, Steven J. P. 'The Medieval Easter Vespers of the Roman Clergy', *Sacris Erudiri* 19 (1969-70), 261-363

Dix, Gregory. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr*. London: S.P.C.K., 1937.

-----. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Paul V. Marshall (ed.). Reprint. New York: The Seabury Press, 1982 (1945).

Dobszay, László. *The Bugnini-Liturgy and the Reform of the Reform*. Front Royal: Church Music Association of America, 2003.

-----. *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Dudley, Martin and Jill Pinnock. 'Rites of Penance and Reconciliation' in Martin Dudley and Geoffrey Rowell (eds.), *Confession and Absolution*, 181-205. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

-----. 'Rewriting the Liturgy: The Theological Implications of Translation' in Stratford Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement*, 97-126. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Dură, Nicolae. 'The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo: Witnesses to the Canonical Tradition in East and West' in George Nedungatt and Michael Featherstone (eds.), *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, 229-262. Rome: Pontifico Istituto Orientale, 1995.

Dye, Gregory H. M. 'Notes and Comments: Some Perspectives on the Western Rite – II', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 26.2 (1982), 125-126.

Ekonomou, Andrew J. *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy From Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590-752*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007

Ellsworth, Lida E. *Charles Lowder and the Ritualist Movement*. London: Dartmon, Longman, and Todd, 1982.

Emminghaus, Johannes H. *The Eucharist: Essence, Form, Celebration*. Trans. Linda M. Maloney. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997.

Erickson, John H. 'Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism 1054', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 14 (1970) 3-24.

-----. 'The Orthodox Canonical Tradition', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 27.3 (1983) 155-167.

-----. 'Reception of Non-Orthodox Clergy Into the Orthodox Church', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 29.2 (1985) 115-132.

van Esbroeck, Michael. 'Le Discours du Catholicos Sahak III en 691 et Quelques Documents Arméniens Annexes au Quinisexte' in George Nedungatt and Michael Featherstone (eds.), *Council in Trullo Revisited*, 322-348. Rome: Pontifico Istituto Orientale, 1995.

Evdokimov, Paul. *The Sacrament of Love: The Nuptial Mystery in the Light of the Orthodox Tradition*. Trans. Anthony P. Gythiel and Victoria Steadman. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

Every, George. *Misunderstandings Between East and West*. Volume IV of *Ecumenical Studies in History*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. *Yearbook of American Churches*. New York: Round Table Press, 1935-39.

Ferrari, Guy. *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of the Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the Fifth Through the Tenth Century*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1957.

Fichet, Francoise and Djuro J. Vrga. 'The Appearance and Growth of Orthodoxy in France', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 22.2 (1977) 214-26.

Florensky, Pavel. *Iconostasis*. Trans. Donald Sheehan and Olga Andrejev. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

Florovsky, Georges. 'Orthodox Ecumenism in the Nineteenth Century', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* (OS) 4.3-4 (1956) 2-53.

Folsom, Cassian. 'Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite' in Anscar J. Chupungo (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, 245-314. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997.

Fortescue, Adrian. *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy*. Reprint. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1953 (1912).

Fountoulis, Ioannis. *Leitourgiki A*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides, 1993.

Galadza, Peter. 'Marriage Rites in the Byzantine Tradition', *Liturgical Ministry* 5.1 (1996), 27-33.

-----. 'The Liturgical Commemoration of Augustine in the Orthodox Church: An Ambiguous *Lex Orandi* for an Ambiguous *Lex Credendi*', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 52.1 (2008), 111-130.

Gassner, Jerome. *The Canon of the Mass: Its History, Theology, and Art*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950.

Gerhards, Albert. *Die Griechische Gregoriosanaphora: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Eucharistischen Hochgebts*. Munich: Westfalen, 1984.

Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Gill, Joseph. *The Council of Florence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

-----. *Byzantium and the Papacy, 1198-1400*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979.

Gihr, Nikolaus. *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Dogmatically, Liturgically, and Ascetically Explained*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949.

Grisbrooke, W. Jardine. *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. London: SPCK, 1958.

-----. 'Obituaries: Archbishop Alexis van der Mensbrugghe', *Sobornost* 4.2 (1980) 212-216.

Groeschel, Benedict J. and James Monti. *In the Presence of Our Lord: The History, Theology, and Psychology of Eucharistic Devotion*. Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing, 1997.

Guiver, George. *Company of Voices: Daily Prayer and the People of God*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1988.

Gusmer, Charles W. *And You Visited Me: Sacramental Ministry to the Sick and the Dying*. Volume VI of *Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1984.

Haddad, Robert M. 'The Stations of the Filioque', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 46.2-3 (2002) 209-68.

Hall, Christine. 'A View From the Foothills: Some Observations on the Orthodox Practice of the Sacrament of Confession' in Martin Dudley and Geoffrey Rowell

(eds.), *Confession and Absolution*, 120-132. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.

Hanson, Richard P. C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

Harakas, Stanley S. *Health and Medicine in the Eastern Orthodox Church: Faith, Liturgy, and Wholeness*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1990.

Härdelin, Alf. *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1965.

Hatchett, Marion J. *Commentary on the American Prayerbook*. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.

-----. *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer, 1776-1789*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.

-----. 'The Colonies and States of America' in Charles Fefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* 176-85. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Haskell, Peter C. 'Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Grafton: An Early Chapter in Anglo-Orthodox Relations in the New World (Part One)', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 11.4 (1967) 193-207.

-----. 'Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Grafton: An Early Chapter in Anglo-Orthodox Relations in the New World (Part Two)', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 12.1 (1968) 2-16.

von Hefele, Karl J. *A History of the Councils of the Church from the Original Documents*. Five Vols. Reprint. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1972 (1896).

Honeycutt, Joseph D. *One Flew Over the Onion Dome: American Orthodox Converts, Retreads, and Reverts*. Salisbury: Regina Orthodox Press, 2006.

Hopko, Thomas. 'Making Unity Happen', *The Word* 49.8 (2005) 21-2.

Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century*. Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1993.

Irwin, Kevin W. *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1994.

Istavridis, Vasileios T. *Orthodoxy and Anglicanism in the Twentieth Century*. Trans. Colin Davies. London: SPCK, 1966.

Jeanes, Gordon P. *Origins of the Roman Rite*. Bramcote: Grove Books, Ltd., 1991.

-----. 'Cranmer and Common Prayer' in Charles Fefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey*, 21-38. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Johnson, Maxwell E. 'From Three Weeks to Forty Days: Baptismal Preparation and the Origins of Lent' *Studia Liturgica* 20.2 (1990) 185-200.

-----. *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thumis*: *A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 249. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995.

-----. *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Rev. ed. Collegeville: Liturgical Press 2007 (1999).

Jones, Robert A. *Independent Sacramental Bishops*. Berkeley: Apocryphile Press, 2010.

Jungmann, Joseph A. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*. Two Vols. Reprint. Trans. Francis A. Brunner. Allen: Christian Classics, 1986 (1951).

Kahle, Wilhelm. *Westliche Orthodoxie: Leben und Ziele Julian Joseph Overbecks*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.

Karmiris, John. *A Synopsis of the Dogmatic Theology of the Orthodox Catholic Church*. Trans. George Dimopoulos. Scranton: Christian Orthodox Edition, 1973.

Kavanagh, Aidan. *The Shape of Baptism: The Rite of Christian Initiation*. Volume I of *Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978.

-----. 'Confirmation: A Suggestion From Structure', *Worship* 58.5 (1984) 386-395.

Keleher, Serge. 'Whatever Happened to the Liturgical Movement: A View from the East', *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement*, 69-96. Stratford Caldecott (ed.). Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Kennedy, V. T. 'The Moment of Consecration', *Medieval Studies* 6 (1944) 121-150.

Kilmartin, Edward J. 'The Active Role of Christ and the Spirit in the Divine Liturgy', *Diakonia* 17.2 (1982) 95-108.

-----. *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*. Robert J. Daly (ed.). Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998.

Klauser, Theodor. *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*. 2nd ed. Trans. John Halliburton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979 (1969).

Knight, Christopher. ‘‘Had the Czar not Died’: Peter the Great and the Nonjurors’, *Sobornost* 11.1-2 (1989) 18-30.

Kolbaba, Tia M. *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000.

-----. ‘The Orthodoxy of the Latins in the Twelfth Century’, *Byzantine Orthodoxies*, 199-214. Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday (eds.). London: SPCK, 2006.

-----. *Inventing Latin Heretics: Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press, 2008.

Kovalevsky, Maxime. *Orthodoxie et Occident: Renaissance d’une Église Locale*. Suresnes: Les Éditions de l’Ancre, 1994.

Kucharek, Casimir A. *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*. Allendale: Alleluia Press, 1971.

-----. *The Sacramental Mysteries: A Byzantine Approach*. Allendale: Alleluia Press, 1976.

L’Hullier, Peter. *The Church of the Ancient Councils: The Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils*. Crestwood: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1996.

Lambrechts, Antonie. ‘Pèlerins bénédictins au Mont Athos’, *Irénikon* 71.2-3 (1998) 281-289.

Leustean, Lucian N. ‘The Romanian Orthodox Church’ in Lucian N. Leustean (ed.), *Eastern Christianity and the Cold War, 1945-91*, 40-59. London: Routledge, 2010.

Limouris, Gennadios. ‘Historical and Ecumenical Perspectives of the Penthekte Ecumenical Council: An Orthodox Perspective’, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 40.1-2 (1995) 65-77.

Litvack, Leon. *John Mason Neale and the Quest for Sobornost*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Louth, Andrew. *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681-1071*. Volume III of *The Church in History*. Crestwood: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2007.

Maan, Petrus 'The Old Catholic Liturgies' in Gordon Huelin (ed.), *Old Catholics and Anglicans, 1931-1981: To Celebrate Fifty Years of Intercommunion*, 86-95. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983

Matlby, Judith. 'From Elizabethan Settlement to the Restoration' in Charles Fefling and Cynthia Shattuck (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey*, 79-92. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Marini, Piero. *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal 1963-1975*. Eds. Mark R. Francis, John R. Page, and Keith Pecklers. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2007.

Martimort, Amié-Georges. 'The Contribution of Liturgical History to the Theology of Marriage' in Richard Malone and John R. Connery (eds.), *Contemporary Perspectives in Christian Marriage: Propositions and Papers from the International Theological Commission*, 297-312. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1984.

Mastrantonis, George. *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence Between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession*. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.

Mateos, Juan. 'The Origins of the Divine Office', *Worship* 41.8 (1967) 477-485.

McKenna, John H. *Eucharist and the Holy Spirit: The Eucharistic Epiclesis in Twentieth Century Theology (1900-1966)*. Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, Ltd., 1975.

McManus, Frederick R. 'The Council in Trullo: A Roman Catholic Perspective' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 40.1-2 (1995) 79-98.

Metzger, Marcel. 'The History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome' in Anscar J. Chupungo (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume III: The Eucharist*, 103-132. Trans. Madeline Beaumont. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

Meyendorff, John. *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975.

-----. 'A Debate on the Western Rite', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 24.4 (1980) 253-255.

-----. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450-680 A.D.* Volume II of *The Church in History*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.

Meyendorff, Paul. 'Liturgy and Spirituality: I. Eastern Liturgical Theology' in Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq (eds.), *Christian Spirituality:*

Origins to the Twelfth Century. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1987.

-----. *The Anointing of the Sick*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2009.

Michalopulos, George and Herb Ham. *The American Orthodox Church: A History of Its Beginnings*. Salisbury: Regina Orthodox Press, 2004.

Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C. E*. New York: Newman Press, 2003.

Mitchell, Nathan. *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*. Volume IV of *Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1990.

-----. 'Introduction' in James F. White, *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today*, ix-xi. 2nd ed. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003 (1995).

-----. 'Reforms, Protestant and Catholic' in Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen Westfield Tucker (eds.), *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 307-350. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

-----. 'The Amen Corner: Rereading Reform', *Worship* 80.5 (2006) 462-470.

Moss, C. Beaufort. *The Old Catholic Movement, Its Origins and History*. Revised Edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1977 (1948).

Morgan, J. H. 'Early, Orthodox – Old Catholic Relations: General Kireeff and Professor Michaud', *Church Quarterly Review* 152.2 (1951) 1-10.

Mott, Winfield S. 'Notes and Comments: Some Perspectives on the Western Rite – I', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 26.2 (1982) 119-125.

Nichols, Aidan. *Rome and the Eastern Churches: A Study in Schism*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.

-----. *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

-----. *Light From the East: Authors and Themes in Orthodox Theology*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1995.

Nichols, Bridget and Alistair MacGregor. *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*. Durham: Ushaw College Library, 2001.

Nikolaou, Theodore. 'Un pont entre l'Église d'Orient et d'Occident: le monachisme', *Irénikon* 57.3 (1984) 307-323.

Nocent, Adrien. 'Christian Initiation in the Roman church from the Fifth Century Until Vatican II' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume IV: Sacraments and Sacramentals*, 49-90. Trans. Edward Hagman. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

-----. 'The Christian Rite of Marriage in the West' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume IV: Sacraments and Sacramentals*, 275-301. Trans. Edward Hagman. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Nockles, Peter B. *The Oxford Movement in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Oakley, John H. and Rebecca H. Sinos. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1993.

O'Loughlin, Frank. *The Future of the Sacrament of Penance*. Strathfield: St. Pauls Publications, 2007.

O'Loughlin, Thomas. *Celtic Theology: Humanity, World, and God in Early Irish Writings*. London: Continuum, 2000.

Olson, Roger E. *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999.

Ouspensky, Leonide. 'The Problem of the Iconostasis', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 8.4 (1964) 186-218.

Papadopoulos, Chrysostom. *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*. John. A. Douglas (Trans.). London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1931.

Parenti, Stefano. 'Care and Anointing of the Sick in the East' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.) *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume IV: Sacraments and Sacramentals*, 161-170. Trans. Edward Hagman. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

-----. 'The Christian Rite of Marriage in the East' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume IV: Sacraments and Sacramentals*, 255-274. Trans. Edward Hagman. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Parsch, Pius. *The Liturgy of the Mass*. Trans. H. E. Winstone. London: B. Herder Publishers, 1961.

Parsons, Edward L. and Bayard H. Jones. *The American Prayer Book: Its Origins and Principles*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Pecklers, Keith F. 'History of the Roman Liturgy From the Sixteenth Until the Twentieth Centuries' in Anscar J. Chupungo (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, 153-178. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997.

Petras, David M. 'The Liturgical Theology of Marriage', *Diakonia* 16.3 (1981) 225-237.

-----. 'Ecumenical Status of the Eastern Catholic Churches', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 37.3-4 (1992) 349-381.

Pfatteicher Philip H. *Festivals and Commemorations: A Handbook to the calendar in the* Lutheran Book of Worship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1980.

-----. *Commentary on the Lutheran Book of Worship: Lutheran Liturgy in its Ecumenical Context*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1990.

Pierce, Joanne. 'The Evolution of the *ordo missae* in the Early Middle Ages' in Lizette Laron-Miller (ed.), *Medieval Liturgy: A Book of Essays*, 3-24. New York: Garland Publishing, 1997.

Pinell i Pons, Jordi. 'History of the Liturgies in the Non-Roman West' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, 179-195. Trans. Colette J. Dees. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997.

Pinnington, Judith. *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion 1559-1725*. Herefordshire: Gracewing, 2003.

Platt, Warren C. 'Polish National Catholic Church: An Inquiry into Its Origins', *Church History* 46.4 (1977) 474-489.

Pomazansky, Michael. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology: A Concise Exposition*. Trans. Seraphim Rose. Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1994.

Poschmann, Bernhard. *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick*. Trans. Francis Courtney. New York: Herder and Herder New York; 1964.

Prichard, Robert W. *A History of the Episcopal Church*. Harrisburg: Morehouse, 1991.

Pusey, Edward B. 'Introductory Essay' in Frederick J. Lee (ed.), *Essays on the Reunion of Christendom by members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican Communions*, pp. xxv-lxxxv. London: J. T. Hayes, 1865.

Quinn, Frank C. 'Confirmation Reconsidered: Rite and Meaning', *Worship* 59.4 (1985) 354-370.

Reed, John S. *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996.

Reid, Alcuin. *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*. Farnborough: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2004.

Reid, Scott M. *A Bitter Trial: Evelyn Waugh and John Carmel Cardinal Heenan on the Liturgical Changes*. Curdridge: Saint Austin Press, 1996.

Reinhold, Hans A. 'Strange Things Happen' *Orate Fratres* 25.8 (1951), 356-362.

Reynolds, Philip. *Marriage in the Western Church: the Christianization of Marriage During the Patristic and Early Medieval Periods*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Richardson, Cyril C. 'The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus', *Harvard Theological Review* 40.2 (1947) 101-108.

Romanides, John S. *Franks, Romans, Feudalism, and Doctrine: An Interplay Between Theology and Society*. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1981.

Rossner, John. 'Orthodoxy and the Future of Western Christianity', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 14.3 (1970) 115-135.

Rouillard, Philippe. 'The Anointing of the Sick in the West' in Anscar J. Chupungco (ed), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume IV: Sacraments and Sacramentals*, 171-190. Trans. Madeleine Beaumont. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Runciman, Steven. *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches During the XIth and XIIth Centuries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

-----. *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople From the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1968.

Russell, James C. *The Germamnization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Rüthy, Albert E. 'The Place of the Old Catholic Church in the Liturgical Scene' *Studia Liturgica* 2.1 (1963) 66-72

Sahas, Daniel J. *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth Century Iconoclasm*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Salachas, Dimitri P. *La Normativa del Concilio Trullano Commentata dai Canonisti Bizantini del XII Secolo: Zonaras, Balsamone, Aristenos*. Palermo: Oriente Cristiano, 1991.

Salkeld, Joseph. 'Decisions of the Holy Synod of Bishops Pertaining to the Western Rite', *Orthodoxy* 12.4 (1969) 5.

Schmemann, Alexander. 'Notes and Comments: The Western Rite', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* (NS) 2.4 (1958) 37-38.

-----. 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America I: The Canonical Problem', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 8.2 (1964) 67-85.

-----. 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America II: The Liturgical Problem', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 8.4 (1964) 164-185.

-----. 'Problems of Orthodoxy in America III: The Spiritual Problem', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 9.4 (1965) 171-194.

-----. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1966.

-----. *Of Water and the Spirit: A Liturgical Study of Baptism*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.

-----. 'Some Reflections Upon "A Case Study"', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 24.4 (1980) 266-269.

-----. *Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.

Schneirla, Paul W. S. 'The Western Rite in the Orthodox Church', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* (NS) 2.1 (1958) 20-44.

-----. 'The Western Rite', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* (NS) 3.1 (1959) 36-37.

-----. 'Some Orthodox Reflections of the Proposed Book of Common Prayer', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 22.2-3 (1978) 115-125.

-----. 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Brief Response From Within', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 45.2 (2001) 193-197.

Schultz, Hans-Joachim. *The Byzantine Liturgy: Symbolic Structure and Faith Expression*. Trans. Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986.

Searle, Mark and Kenneth W. Stevenson (eds.). *Documents of the Marriage Liturgy*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.

Sefton, Henry R. 'The Scottish Bishops and Archbishop Arsenius' in Derek Baker (ed.), *The Orthodox Churches and the West: Papers Read at the Fourteenth Summer*

Meeting and Fifteenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society, 239-246. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1976

Senn, Frank C. *Christian Worship: Catholic and Evangelical*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

Serafim, Archimandrite. *The Quest for Orthodox Church Unity in America: A History of the Orthodox Church in North America in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Saints Boris and Gleb Press, 1973.

Shaw, Plato E. *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church*. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1930.

Shepherd, Massey H. *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955 (1950).

Skinner, Barbara. *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in Eighteenth Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009.

Smith, Allyne L. 'Review Essay: *Saint Andrew Service Book: The Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies According to the Western Rite Usage of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America*', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 41.2-3 (1997) 249-268.

Smith, Malhon H. *'And Taking Bread…' Cerularius and the Azyme Controversy of 1054*. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977.

Southern, Richard W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1970.

Sopko, Andrew J. 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Case Study and a Reappraisal', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 24.4 (1980) 255-265.

Speake, Graham. *Mount Athos: Renewal in Paradise*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Spinks, Bryan D. 'The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James', *Studia Liturgica* 11.1 (1976) 19-38.

-----. *Western Use and Abuse of Eastern Liturgical Traditions: Some Cross-Sections of its History*. Rome: Center for Indian and Inter-Religious Studies, 1992.

-----. *Sacraments, Ceremonies, and the Stuart Divines*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2002.

-----. *Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism: From the New Testament to the Council of Trent*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.

-----. 'Anglicans and Dissenters' in Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen Westfield Tucker (eds.) *Oxford History of Christian Worship*, 492-533. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

-----. 'The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer: What Jungmann Omitted to Say' in Brian D. Spinks (ed.), *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer: Trinity, Christology, and Liturgical Theology*, 1-19. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2008.

Stephenson, Colin. *Walsingham Way*. London: Dartmon, Longman, and Todd, 1970.

Stevens, William P. *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Stevenson, Kenneth W. *Nuptial Blessing: A Study of Christian Marriage Rites*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

----. *To Join Together: The Rite of Marriage*. Volume V of *Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1987.

Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. *On the Apostolic Tradition*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.

Sundberg, Walter. 'Limitations of the Lectionary', *Word and World* 10.1 (1990) 14-20.

de la Taille, Maurice. *The Mystery of Faith, Book II: The Sacrifice of the Church*. (*Mysterium Fide*; Paris: Beauchesne, 1931). Trans. Joseph Carroll and P. J. Dalton. London: Sheed and Ward, 1950.

Taft, Robert F. *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1984.

-----. *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, Volume 4: The Diptychs*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991

-----. 'From Logos to Spirit: On the Early History of the Epiclesis' in Andreas Heinz, Heinrich Rennings, and Deutschen Liturgischen Institut (eds.), *Gratis Agamus: Studien zum Eucharistischen Hochgebt für Balthasar Fischer*, 489-502. Freiburg: Herder, 1992.

-----. 'Ecumenical Scholarship and the Catholic-Orthodox Epiclesis Dispute', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 45.3-4 (1996) 201-226.

-----. ‘The Epiclesis Question in the Light of the Orthodox and Catholic *Lex Orandi* Traditions’ in Bradley Nassif (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, 210-237. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.

-----. ‘The Liturgy in the Life of the Church’, *Logos* 40.1-4 (1999) 187-229.

-----. ‘Mass Without Consecration?: The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist Between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East’, *Worship* 77.6 (2003) 482-509.

-----. ‘Is There Devotion to the Holy Eucharist in the Christian East?’, *Worship* 80.3 (2006) 213-233.

-----. *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It*. Berkeley: InterOrthodox Press, 2006.

Talley, Thomas J. *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1986.

Tarasar, Constantine J. *Orthodox America, 1794-1776: Development of the Orthodox Church in America*. Syosset: Orthodox Church in America, 1975.

Thomann, Günther. H. *The Western Rite in Orthodoxy: Union and Reunion Schemes of Western and Eastern Churches with Eastern Orthodoxy: A Brief Historical Outline*. Claremont: Anglican Theological Seminary in California, 1995.

Thompson, Bard. *Liturgies of the Western Church*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1961.

Tillyrides, Markarios. ‘Orthodoxy in Britain: Past, Present and Future’ in John Behr, Andrew Louth, and Dimitri Conomos (eds.), *Abba: The Tradition of Orthodoxy in the West: Festschrift fo Bishop Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia*, 135-155. Crestwood: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2003.

Timiadis, Emilianos. *The Sacraments of Confession and the Confessor*. Joensuun: Joensuun Yliopisto, 2001.

Turner, Alexander. ‘Western Rite Orthodoxy: A New Era’, *Orthodoxy* 9.1 (1961) 5.

-----.. ‘A Mass Commemorating the Patriarchs and Prophets of the Old Law’, *Orthodoxy* 9.1 (1961) 29.

-----. ‘Edwin Elliot West’, *Orthodoxy* 10.6 (1965) 165.

Turner, Jack. 'The Road Thus Far: A Review of the Literature of Western-Rite Orthodoxy', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 53.4 (2009) 477-505.

-----. '"And We Beseech Thee to Send Down Thy Holy Spirit": History, Liturgy, and Theology in the Epiclesis Text of the Divine Liturgy of St. Gregory', *Studia Liturgica* 39.2 (2009) 202-215.

Turner, Paul. 'The Origins of Confirmation: An Analysis of Aidan Kavanagh's Hypothesis', *Worship* 65.4 (1991) 320-336.

Urban, Hugh. 'The Devil at Heaven's Gate: Rethinking the Study of Religion in the Age of Cyber Space', *Nova Religio* 3.2 (2000) 268-302.

Uspensky, N. D. 'The Western Rite Restored' (Part One), *Orthodoxy* 9.4 (1962) 113-124.

-----. 'The Western Rite Restored' (Part Two), *Orthodoxy* 9.5 (1962) 142-150.

Vlasto, Alexis P. *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Vogel, Cyrille. *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*. Trans. William G. Storey and Niels K. Rasmussen. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1986.

Ward, Gary L, Bertil Persson, and Alan Bain (eds.). *Independent Bishops: An International Directory*. Detroit: Apogee Books, 1990.

Ware, Kallistos (Timothy). 'Orthodox and Catholics in the Seventeenth Century: Schism or Intercommunion?' in Darek Baker (ed.), *Schism, Heresy, and Religious Protest: Papers Read at the Tenth Summer Meeting and Eleventh Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical Historical Society*, 259-276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

-----. *The Orthodox Church*. Revised Ed. London: Penguin Books, 1997.

Weakland, Rmbert G. 'Ecumenism and the Eastern Catholic Churches', *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 40.1-4 (1999) 333-349.

White, James F. *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today*. Second Edition. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003 (1995).

Williams, George. *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, Being the Correspondence Between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops: With an Introduction on Various Projects of the Reunion Between the Eastern Church and the Anglican Communion*. Reprint. New York: AMS Press, 1970 (1868).

Willis, Geoffrey G. 'God's Altar on High', *The Downside Review* 90.301 (1972) 245-250.

Winkler, Gabriele. 'Confirmation or Chrismation? A Study in Comparative Liturgy', *Worship* 58.1 (1984) 2-17.

Woolfenden, Gregory. 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: Some Reflections on a Liturgical Question', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 45.2 (2001) 163-192.

Wooding, Lucy C. *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Woolley, Reginald M. *The Liturgy of the Primitive Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

-----. *The Bread of the Eucharist*. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1913.

Wybrew, Hugh. *The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990.

Yannaras, Christos. *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*. (Athens: Ekdoseis Domos, 1992). Peter Chamberas and Norman Russell (Trans.). Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006.

Yates, Nigel. *Liturgical Space: Christian Worship and Church Buildings in Western Europe 1500-2000*. Burlington; Ashgate, 2008.

Youdell, Basil. 'The Orthodox Church of France: A Brief Survey', *ENCL: The Journal of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association* NS 23.3 (1986), 16-21.

Yonan, Simon. 'American Letter', *The Christian East: A Quarterly Review Devoted Primarily to the Study of the Eastern Churches* 4.2 (1923) 101-105.

Zizioulas, John. 'Orthodox Ecclesiology and the Ecumenical Movement', *Sourozh* 21.1 (1985) 16-27.

Dissertations and Theses

Abramtsov, David F. 'The Western Rite and the Eastern Church: Dr. J. J. Overbeck and His Scheme for the Re-Establishment of the Orthodox Church in the West'. M.A. thesis, University of Pittsburg, 1961.

Albertine, Richard. 'Problem of the (Double) Epiclesis in the New Roman Eucharistic Prayers.' Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1972.

Alford, Nicholas R. 'A Hymnal for Use in Western Rite Orthodox Churches'. D.Min. thesis, Pittsburg Theological Seminary, 2000.

Andersen, Benjamin J. 'An Anglican Liturgy in the Orthodox Church: The Origins and Development of the Antiochian Orthodox Liturgy of Saint Tikhon'. M.Div. thesis, Saint Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, 2005.

Hughes, Edward. 'The Paraliturgical Devotions of the Western Church and Their Role in Orthodoxy'. M.Div. thesis, Saint Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, 1980.

Johnson, Matthew R. '"Outward and Visible Signs": The Anglo-Catholic Liturgical Movement: An Analysis of the Historical Development of Anglo-Catholic Rite and Ceremony'. M.C.S. thesis, Regent College, 1986.

Jorgenson, Wayne J. 'The *Augustana Graeca* and the Correspondence Between the Tübingen Lutherans and Patriarch Jeremias: Scripture and Tradition in Theological Methodology'. Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1979.

Martin, Edward J. 'The Bread of the Eucharist: A Study of the Quality of the Bread Used in the Early Christian Eucharist in Light of the Azyme Controversy Between the Greeks and Latins'. S.T.D. diss., Pontificiam Universitatem S. Thomae, 1970.

Mast, Gregg A. 'The Eucharistic Service of the Catholic Apostolic Church and Its Influence on the Reformed Liturgical Renewals of the Nineteenth Century'. Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1985.

Platt, Warren C. 'The Liberal Catholic Church: An Analysis of a Hybrid Sect'. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1982.

Romano, John F. 'Ritual and Society in Early Medieval Rome'. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2007.

Turfa, Arthur W. 'Lost Opportunity Yet Seed Bed for Later Dialogue: The Council of Ferarra-Florence as Springboard for Encounters Between Western and Eastern Christianity'. D.Litt. diss., Drew University, 2007.

Ugarte, Elisa E. 'The Participation of the Laity in the Liturgy of the Hours: The Reform that Failed'. J.C.L. thesis, Catholic University of America, 2004.

Weiss, Joseph E. 'Jesuits and the Liturgy of the Hours'. Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1992.

Magazines, Newspapers, and Newsletters

Abramtsov, David F. 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy', *The Word* 6.4 (1961), 14-27.

-----. 'A Brief History of Western Orthodoxy in Modern Times', *One Church* 15 (1961), 226-236.

Bashir, Anthony. 'Thirteenth General Convention: The Western Rite', *The Word* 2.11 (1958) 16.

Johnson, Michael. 'The "Western Rite" – Is it Right for Orthodoxy', *The Priest: A Newsletter for the Clergy of the Diocese of San Francisco* 5.5 (1995). http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/johnson.html (accessed 23 February 2009).

'Man With a Mission', *TIME Magazine* 46.10 (Monday, 3 Sept. 1945) 73.

McCauley, Patrick. 'Proposal for the Establishment of a House of Western-Rite Orthodox Studies', *Credo* (April, 1994) 30.

Milkovich, Annette. 'Western Rite Orthodoxy: Its History, Its Validity, and Its Opportunity', Interview with Fr. Paul W. Schneirla. *The Russian Orthodox Journal* 63 (November 1990), 7-10, 25.

Moynihan, Robert. 'The Bitter Struggle: Interview with Archimandrite Boniface Luykx', *Inside the Vatican*. May 1996, 16-20.

'Orthodoxy: A Faith for East and West'. Stanton: St. Luke's Priory Press, n.d.

'Orthodoxy: Eastern but Western', *TIME Magazine* 83.18 (Friday, 1 May 1964) 64.

Schneirla, Paul W. S. 'Report of the Western Rite Vicar General', *The Word* 14.8 (1970) 18-19.

-----. 'Minutes of the Annual Convention – Report on the Western Rite', *The Word* 16.9 (1972) 16.

-----. 'Report of the Western Rite Vicariate – 1978', *The Word* 22.9 (1978) 32-33.

-----. 'Editorial: The Twain Meet', *The Word* 37.5 (1993) 3.

Ware, Kallistos (Timothy). 'Some Thoughts on "Western Rite" Orthodoxy', *The Priest: The Priest: A Newsletter for the Clergy of the Diocese of San Francisco* 5.5

(1995). http://www.holy-trinity.org/modern/western-rite/ware.html (accessed 14 March 2009).

Manuscripts, Pamphlets, Speeches, and Self-Published and Unpublished Works

Antiochian Western Rite Vicariate. 'Practical Tips for Moving to Western Orthodoxy'. Stanton: St Luke's Priory Press, 2000.

Connely, John C. '*Lux Occidentalis*: The Orthodox Western Rite and the Liturgical Tradition of Western Orthodox Christianity with Reference to the *Orthodox Missal*, Saint Luke's Priory Press, Stanton, NJ, 1995'. Denver: St. Mark's Orthodox Church, 1999. http://www.westernorthodox.com/Lux-Occidentalis (accessed 14 March 2009).

Keiser, Michael D. *Children of the Promise: An Introduction to Western Rite Orthodoxy*. Bloomington; AuthorHouse, 2004.

-----. *Offering the Lamb: Reflections on the Western Rite Mass the Orthodox Church*. Bloomington; AuthorHouse 2006.

Keller, Aiden. 'Amalfion: Western Rite Monastery of Mount Athos: A Monograph With Notes and Illustrations'. Austin: St Hilarion Press, 2002. http://www.allmercifulsavior.com/Liturgy/Amalfion%20Oct%202002.pdf (accessed 12 March 2007).

Lambriniadis, Elpidophoros. 'Challenges of Orthodoxy in America and the Role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate'. Address to Saint Andrew Clergy Brotherhood of the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Boston, 16 March 2009 at http://www.hchc.edu /holycross/about/news/news_releases/InauguralPatriarchateLecture.html. (accessed 30 March 2009).

Roman, Bishop. 'A Directory of Western Rite Parishes, Including Clergy and Monasteries'. Akron: Eastern Christian Press, 1986.

Stratman, Chrysostomos H. 'The Roman Rite in Orthodoxy'. Chicago: The Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957.

Turner, Alexander. 'The Western Rite: Its Fascinating Past and Its Promising Future'. Mount Vernon: Society of St Basil, n.d.

-----. 'An Orthodox Primer'. Mount Vernon: Society of St Basil, 1955.